THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF THE CHRISTIAN THOUGHT AND LIFE SET FORTH FROM THE SCRIPTURES BY EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

VOL. XXXVII, No. 1 JANUARY, 1931

Some Thoughts on Influx
EVERETT K. BRAY 1

The Doctrine of Life and Modern Politics
MALCOLM E. NICHOLS 12

Uses of the Scriptures' Internal Sense
LESLIE MARSHALL 25

The Gift of the Mountains
ASA E. GODDARD 38

Emerson and the Swedenborgians
CLARENCE HOTSON, PH.D. 46

"Religion in a Changing World" [A review of Dr. Silver's book]
LEWIS F. HITE 79

(For Editorial Department, see next page.)

238
931

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT

Editorials :

What the Bible Is, and What It Does for Us LEWIS F. HITE - 87
A New Dispensation WILLIAM F. WUNSCH - - - - - 99

Biblical and Doctrinal Studies :

The Theological Works and Textual Criticism of the Bible
WILLIAM F. WUNSCH - - - - - - - - 104

Current Literature :

C. Luther Fry's "The U. S. Looks at its Churches"
B. A. WHITTEMORE - - - - - - - - - 120
Princess Marthe Bibesco's "Egyptian Day"
F. M. BILLINGS - - - - - - - - - - 127

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW first appeared in January, 1894, succeeding the monthly *New Jerusalem Magazine* (established in 1827). The quarterly form is adapted to more elaborate articles and fuller discussion of current literature and current events. The REVIEW aims to serve as an international organ of the best thought, progressive and constructive as well as retrospective and critical, of the New Church.

The Board of Editors consists of the Rev. Lewis F. Hite as managing editor, the Rev. William F. Wunsch (in charge of "Studies") and Mr. B. A. Whittemore (in charge of "Current Literature"); with the Rev. H. Clinton Hay and Mr. Kenneth P. Kempton in an advisory capacity.

Published by THE MASS. NEW-CHURCH UNION

134 BOWDOIN STREET, BOSTON.

50 CENTS A COPY ALBERT P. CARTER, Treas. $2.00 A YEAR

(Postage to Canada 8 Cents, and to Europe 16 Cents Extra, Per Annum.)

Entered at the Post-Office at Boston as Second Class Matter (Printed in U.S.A.)

OFFICERS OF THE GENERAL CONVENTION OF THE NEW JERUSALEM.—*President*, Rev. Paul Sperry, 1824 Park Road, Washington, D. C.; *Vice-President*, Mr. Ezra Hyde Alden, 1419 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.; *Secretary*, Mr. B. A. Whittemore, 134 Bowdoin Street, Boston 9, Mass.; *Treasurer*, Mr. Albert P. Carter, 511 Barristers Hall, Boston, Mass.

THE
NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

VOL. XXXVIII] JANUARY, 1931 [No. 1

SOME THOUGHTS ON INFLUX

BY THE REV. EVERETT K. BRAY

IN increasing measure the impression is borne in upon us that there is a practical aspect of the New-Church doctrine of influx which the New Church and New-Churchmen have not as yet laid hold of to the degree that they may possibly learn to do.

In the declaration of the principle of influx, high hope is justified. Drowsy indeed must he be, who, upon receiving it, is not awakened and aroused with a moving sense of great possibilities of life yet waiting for reception. For there he sees at one end of the scale, Life Itself, in its Source, in its Being, Life at its Fountain-head—the very Sun of the Spiritual World, which is to all things spiritual as the sun of the natural world is to all things natural. There he sees Life pouring or radiating itself forth, offering, seeking, pressing to be received. At the other end of the scale, he sees himself, his fellow men, human society, the Church, as the objects which this Life is seeking; the receptacles, forms, orders, organisms, which It seeks to infill, to imbue with Itself, and thereby to quicken, re-form, re-order, re-vitalize, unto a truly living kind of self-realization.

Such is the first, general, picture of the field and function of influx. It stirs the imagination. It quickens hope. It seems to say of man's littleness, "No matter. In yourself you are nothing of consequence, it is true. But if you will but receive Him as the flowers of spring lift their faces to

receive the sun, all things are possible in you and through you,—all things that the Lord shall see desirable to do in you and through you. You see what He did with those simple men, the early disciples and apostles. You see now how branches of the Vine may live from the life of the Vine's sap, and how they may have their blessed part in the experience and the use of bearing the Vine's fruit, of bearing it even more abundantly. Life, unlimited life, is at the door. There can be no lack. "The LORD is my Shepherd. I shall not want". My cup shall be full, until it overflows, if "I lift up my soul unto" Him. All this is not too much to say of the wonder-working possibilities, or of the actual achievements of influx. Everything that man can conceive of that is truly desirable (desirable, that is, in the sight of heaven), is held out to him through the avenue of influx.

The impression is too readily extracted from careless listening to this general truth of influx, that the only thing requisite to the fullest measure of receiving, is merely to ask for it; and that if there be any specifications here, they are all under the heading of sincerity and earnestness of yearning in the request made. This seems to find support, of course, in an unqualified, literal, reading of some passages in the Word. But true doctrine places beside all such passages, some others which give the needed qualifying; such as that added to "asking" there shall be also "seeking" and "knocking"; or that "ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done", "*if* ye abide in Me *and My words abide in you*"; and that "Ye are My friends," "*if ye do* whatsoever I command you".

The fact is that influx has *a way to flow*. Unless, therefore, that "way" is provided for in the would-be recipient, influx cannot "flow" in that place. In other words, to put the "vessels" that should receive life into the condition to receive it, there are conditions to be met. Were it not for the "conditions", New-Church people (knowing, as they do, the availability of all rightly desired life) would assuredly

be the happiest people, the healthiest people, the livest people, the most efficient people (in personal living and in contribution to social betterment) in this world. And this would be true not in exceptional cases merely, but it would be the prevailing rule. So would it be with the organic New Church, and with every society within it. Everywhere that the New Church could be found, there would be "church life", the healthiest, happiest, livest, the most efficient and so most blessed, in all the things of that function which is the proper life of "The Church". If this fulness of life is not now the rule with us individually, or with the Church, it seems as if it ought to be our most earnest and persistent quest, to learn wherein we may meet and provide the "conditions" which will make our measures full.

Of course this quest must take us to a diligent re-examination of the very doctrines in the midst of which we have been informed of the fact of this wonderful reality of influx. In the initial stage of this quest, our attention is caught by this fundamental assertion, viz:

> The happiest life is from love to the Lord and love towards the neighbor, because the Divine Itself flows into it; . . . and the most unhappy life is from the love of self and of the world, because Hell inflows into it. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 3539.)

Next, we become interested in more careful examination into exactly what "influx" is; and from this we proceed to the manner and mode of its operation. Here we are brought to pause by the assertion:

> Influx is effected by correspondences: it cannot be effected by continuity. (Divine Love and Wisdom, n. 88.)
> Not by continuity, but by contiguity. (*Ibid.*, n. 56.)

Perhaps we could paraphrase this by putting it: Influx is effected, not by "throughness" but by "nextness". And just what kind of thing this "influx" by "contiguity", by "correspondence," is, we find illustrated by examples, as follow:

> The action of the lower mind into the face . . . is called influx. The action of the understanding into the eye . . . is called influx.

The action of thought into speech . . . is called influx. The action of hearing into obedience . . . is called influx. (Apocalypse Explained, n. 1080[2].)

We stop at this sign-post long enough to meditate upon what it means, and to make ourselves certain that we actually see the direction in which it is leading us. For here, assuredly, is a kind of "in-flowing" of which we have not heard men speak. It is a kind of inflowing in which that which "flows-in" does not itself really *come in!* Or, if we still insist on saying that "it does flow-in", then we face the discovery that, when it has "arrived-in", it is then and there *something else.* In short, we come to a grasp of the principle, that influx is a cause-and-effect relation and operation. The example of *thought inflowing into speech* is a clear working-pattern. The action of the affection into the smile of the face, is equally easy to use as an example of this kind of "flowing-in" which influx is. The thought is one thing, one substance, on one plane, wholly different from the thing, the substance, the plane, proper to speech as articulated sound. So the affection and the smile portraying it are equally distinct and different. Yet, it is perfectly true, that the thought is in the speech (or, can be in it), and the affection is in, or can be in, the smile. Yet it must still be observed that while one is "in" the other, they remain of different substances, on different planes of experience. Yet so far as the thought is in the speech, the affection within the smile, it is the form of the thought that gives form to the speech, and it is the quality of the affection that gives character to the smile. By this formula, therefore it is possible to keep in clear thought, how it is that as man receives good and truth from the Lord, to that degree will good and truth give character and form or order to his life and to his living; to that degree these springs of heaven will be in his personality and in his deeds, and will utter themselves in his whole life and in all his life-uses.

Proceeding with inquiry into the nature and method of influx, we learn:

General influx is a constant endeavor from the Lord through the universal heaven into each single thing which is of the life of man. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 6211.)

Next we may learn that, so far as men receive this influx from the Lord,

This reception is according to their application to themselves of the laws of order, which are Divine truths, in the exercise of that freedom of thinking and willing according to reason, which they possess from the Lord as if it were their own . . . By this there is a reciprocation of love. (Divine Love and Wisdom, n. 57.)

Here we have begun to touch the matter of "the conditions" which must be provided by man, if he would attain to the greater measures of life which influx offers. Men will receive it and its blessings "according to their application to themselves of the laws of order". Again, we see it stated in this way:

Man is in God in proportion as he lives according to order . . . But . . . in proportion as he lives against order, he closes the lower things of his mind, and thus prevents God's descending and filling these lower regions with His presence. (True Christian Religion, n. 70.)

Here the necessity, the condition to be met is, that the man shall live "according to order".

The first key, then, to reception of "influx from the Lord" is to learn what "order" is. Upon this question we find light in the following:

The laws of order enjoined upon man are, that he shall acquire for himself *truths from The Word,* and reflect upon them naturally, and thus acquire for himself a natural faith. . . [Then the Lord] will draw near and fill *these truths* with His Divine light, and thus fill man's natural faith with a Divine essence. . . . In this and in no other way can faith become saving. (*Ibid.,* n. 73.)

Thus, acquirement of truths from The Word becomes our first necessity. Again, we have it stated this way:

The ordinary way is that instruction must precede; and that the influx takes place according to the *degree* of instruction. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 3141.)

Good from the Lord cannot inflow except into truths. (*Ibid.*, n. 3387.)

By means of Knowledges the way is opened from the internal man to the external, in which are Knowledges of good and truth. Celestial things inflow into these as into their vessels. (*Ibid.*, n. 1458.)

The logic supporting the requirement that truths must serve as a beginning may more readily appear from seeing clearly what the Divine Order is, as in the following:

Divine Order is caused by the Divine good that flows forth from the Lord. It begins in Him, goes forth from Him through the heavens in succession into the world, and is terminated there in outmosts. (True Christian Religion, n. 107.)

Our life obviously cannot reach what it should attain unto, save as it fits itself to the Divine Order, or to "the Stream of Providence", as it is beautifully called in another place. And only truths can show us where, and what, and how, that Order is, and how we may proceed to conform ourselves to it. One of the first of those truths needed is this truth, that we must learn truths. Doubtless there are very many things that we may learn, which, if practiced, will enable us to increase our reception of the influx of the Lord's Order. We shall be content at this time if we can only make a beginning.

Of course, it need hardly be said, that actual evil, conscious sin, wilful disobedience of the letter or even of the spirit of the Commandments, must cut off influx, as we have it repeatedly emphasized in principles such as this:

If the will is not in good . . . the influx of the Lord into the understanding . . . is dissipated . . . because the truths do not remain except in proportion as the will has been reformed. (Apocalypse Explained, n. 730.)

But what may easily pass unobserved, are things which do not present the appearance of sin. Some of these lie merely in neglect of deeds; some merely in attitudes. Even ignorance prevents (or limits) influx. Among other things are such things as fear, and pessimism. For example, this is what fear may do:

Fear is attended with this: that it disperses itself into the souls of those who are near, and who are conjoined by some affection; and then those who want to inflict evil are at once at hand. . . This is the source of many misfortunes. (Diarium Minor, n. 4744.)

Fear can never invade the internal of thought; this is always in freedom . . . but it can invade the external of thought; and when it does so, the internal of thought is closed; and then the man cannot be reformed. . . The fear which enters the external of thought and closes the internal, is chiefly the fear of the loss of honor and gain. (Divine Providence, n. 139.)

Here is another case where attitude determines influx. It is declared:

Good cannot inflow into what is negative, nor indeed into doubt. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 3913.)

The force of the principle here stated, lies in the fact that it rests back on the law of Correspondence. If you would receive affection, provide for it a smile; give it, that is, an invitation by providing the correspondent vessel. If you would receive thoughts, provide for them the watching, listening frame-work; invite them by offering them the correspondent form, which will be an invitation to them to come. The principle is expressed in the often-heard saying of to-day's popular psychology, that "One gets what he looks for." If we really do want our own life, and the life of our New Church, to become the truly and fully *living* thing that the principle of influx should make possible, then one of the "conditions" which we must meet will be, that we shall have to deliberately cultivate a *positive* and *believing* state of mind regarding them. Rather than to dwell on the past failures, and measure present and future possibilities by them, we shall have to think on the basis of the Lord's abundance and His unquestioned desire to inflow with the fullest measure that can be received. Habitually we shall have to hear Him saying to us, and to the Church:

Bring ye all of the tithes into the storehouse, . . . and prove Me now herewith, . . . if I will not open you the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing that there shall not be room enough to receive it. (Mal. 3, 10.)

What we shall have concern about will be, that we do make certain that we *do bring all the tithes;* that we learn what those "tithes" are that we in the past have neglected to bring, and that perhaps we have not even found. We must remember that "good cannot inflow into what is negative, nor indeed into doubt." And we shall have to learn to practice the truth which fills with promise the attitude which is opposite, of which we read thus:

> But when it becomes affirmative innumerable things accede, and they are infilled with the good which inflows; for good continually inflows from the Lord. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 3913.)

And there is another consideration, which involves deed as well as attitude. It is one that every New-Churchman, and every New-Church society, knows, but which is not by any means yet put into universal practice. It is this:

> It is a universal law that influx accommodates itself according to efflux; and if the efflux is preserved, the influx is preserved. Through the internal man there is an influx of good and truth from the Lord; through the external man there ought to be an efflux into the life,—that is, in the exercise of charity. When there is an efflux, the influx from heaven is continuous; . . . whereas if the efflux does not exist, . . . the influx accommodates itself to the efflux. Hence the influx of good withdraws itself, and thereby the internal passage of the influx is closed. (*Ibid.*, n. 5828.)

In short, *influx is in the effort.* It would seem to be the case, that every impulse to a good deed, is an invitation to us to put ourselves in form to receive further measures of influx; and that on every occasion wherein we fail to carry this out into deed, we are to that degree impeding and cutting-off the inflow of good which the Lord is seeking to give to us, i.e., to exemplify in us and through us. We are there standing across the channel down which "the Stream of Providence" would come to us, and to others through us. May be that we shall learn, if we set ourselves seriously to become informed of how we can better put ourselves and our societies of the New Church into form adequately receptive of the living life from the Lord; it may be that we shall learn that we cannot afford *not* to do some of the

things we have been more comfortably thinking we could not afford *to* do.

We shall not press farther in this paper than to set down a number of other pertinent passages from Swedenborg, and to offer a very brief summary. To quote:

By loving the Lord is not meant loving Him in person; it is *not by this love alone* that man is conjoined with heaven, but by the love of Divine good and Divine truth, *which are the Lord* in heaven and in the Church.

And these two principles are not loved by knowing and thinking of them, or by understanding and speaking of them, *but by willing and doing them, for this reason, that they are commanded by the Lord,* and hence because they are uses.

Nothing is full or complete until it becomes a deed; the deed is the end in view, and the end for the sake of which the deed is done, is love. And therefore it is from the love of willing and doing something, that the love of knowing it, of thinking it, and of understanding it, exists. Tell me why you are desirous of knowing and understanding a thing, unless it is for the sake of an end which you love; the end which is loved is a deed. If you say it is for the sake of belief, it is belief alone, or a belief merely of the thought, without actual belief which is deed; it is thus a nonentity.

You are very much deceived if you think that you believe in God, unless you do the things which are of God. For the Lord teaches in John: "He that hath My precepts and doeth them, he it is who loveth Me, and I will make My abode with him; but he who loveth Me not keepeth not My words." (14:21, 24.) In a word, to love and to do are one, and therefore in the Word where mention is made of loving, doing is understood, and where mention is made of doing, loving is also understood; for that which I love, I do. (Apocalypse Explained, n. 1099.)

The human soul, being a higher spiritual substance, receives influx immediately from God; but the human mind, being a lower spiritual substance, receives influx from God mediately through the spiritual world; and the body, being from the substances of nature,. . . receives influx from God mediately through the natural world. (Intercourse of Soul and Body, n. 8.)

The reception of this influx is according to the state of love and wisdom with the man. (*Ibid.,* n. 13.)

All who love truth receive influx from the Lord. (De Verbo, n. 9.)

Man is led and taught not immediately by any dictate, nor by any

perceptible inspiration; *but by influx into his spiritual delight.* (Apocalypse Explained, n. 825.)

The influx from the Spiritual World is not only into the interior man in general, but also into every single thing, down to the bodily things; *for the influx is into the functions and uses of the bodily things;* . . . it is also into the forms, for the uses and the forms make a one. . . Thus *when the influx* from the Spiritual World *is effected into the use of the organ, it is effected into the organ itself.* . . When the influx is effected into the sight, it is also effected into the eye. . . (Spiritual Diary, n. 4630.)

To "approach before Jehovah" signifies influx . . . and therefore its reception; for reception is the reciprocal of influx. The reason it also signifies application, is that reception *is not anything unless there is also application to use.* For the influx from the Divine passes through first into perception, which is of the understanding . . . thence into the will; and afterwards into act, . . . and there ceases. When the influx of good and truth from the Lord makes this transit, then good and truth are appropriated to the man; *for then the influx goes down into the ultimate of order;* that is, into the ultimate of nature, into which all influx tends. *The man with whom the Divine influx goes thus, may be called the way of Heaven.* (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 8439.)

All are perfected through the implantation of faith and charity *in the external man;* for unless they are implanted there, good and truth cannot inflow from the internal man, that is, from the Lord through him; for there is no reception, and if there is no reception (i.e., termination, or ultimation), the influx perishes. (*Ibid.*, n. 8452.)

They who are in the Lord manifestly perceive that life inflows; consequently that good and truth do so. (*Ibid.*, n. 8497.)

The reason that the Divine cannot inflow with a man so long as he is in these sensuous things, is that the influx from the Divine advances down to those things which are last in order, thus down to the sensuous things; . . . and if there are therein merely bodily and earthly things, the Divine things which inflow are dissipated there, because they do not agree. . . Therefore when a man is about to receive the Divine, . . . he is elevated from sensuous things; and when he has been elevated from them, the Divine no longer inflows . . . into the external sensuous; but into the interior plane into which the man has been elevated. (*Ibid.*, n. 6845.)

In briefest summary, then, we may set down these few principles:

First. The measure of influx into ourselves, and into the collective bodies which we form, is in our hands.

Second, the principles by which influx operates, and by the observance of which we may increase reception, are, in part, at least, these:

1. Influx is by contiguity and not by continuity; that is, it is by discrete degrees.
2. Influx is by correspondence, and into correspondences. This we understand to mean, that influx is into forms perfectly adapted to respond to the life qualities desired.
3. Influx is into truths. But it continues to flow into them in the degree only that they are welcomed in a will-to-good, a will, that is, to carry them by obedience into effect.
4. Influx is into endeavor, and in measure proportioned to efflux. The man and the church that would adequately receive life from the Lord must be "a channel" conveying His gifts, and not "a stagnant pool" holding them. Muscles unused disintegrate; used they grow in strength for further use.
5. Influx is into order, in proportion as order is recognized and followed; and the continuous effect of order flowing into order, is to produce more order, both intensively and extensively.

EVERETT K. BRAY.

THE DOCTRINE OF LIFE AND MODERN POLITICS

By the Hon. Malcolm E. Nichols

THE title of this essay, "The Doctrine of Life and Modern Politics", I have taken exactly as suggested to me by the worthy secretary of the New-Church Club of Boston. In a recent communication he said that some of the members thought well of having these twin topics set up for discussion.

In his "Doctrine of Life" Swedenborg indicates how men should conduct their affairs in order to obey the spirit as well as the letter of the Commandments. Politics is the art of governing, and touches in some manner every avenue through which human affairs run their course. A government is concerned with medicine, law, education, trade, and broadly with all questions of public convenience and safety. Politics is everybody's business; and the doctrine of life which in private affects the attitude of a man towards his neighbor, in public not only does this but also affects the attitude of the public towards itself.

During the days of the Most Ancient Church conditions were such that, when earthly and worldly things were mentioned, there was present the thought of the spiritual and the celestial things which they represented. Then came the successive posterities of the Most Ancient Church, until the last, which was next before the Flood, was so lost and was so immersed in sensual and corporeal things that its members did not want to hear what the truth of faith was. They were separated from the knowledge of good and truth, and left to their own persuasions. It was so provided less they should profane the holy things of faith. Spiritual conditions fell to the level of natural conditions. It was a per-

manent change which has ever since prevailed despite the influence of Christianity.

A glance at the ancient world anywhere within the lapse of thousands of years will reveal the triumph of materialism. In Rome as well as in the Oriental despotisms the drift was always toward power and splendor. In Israel, materialism and formalism turned toward a scrupulous and critical observance of the Hebraic law.

When faith was destroyed in the old Roman dieties, Stoicism attempted to provide a philosophical substitute. The late emperors however realized that a national religion was essential for the multitude; and, as the worship of Apollo was well understood throughout the eastern domains, it was carried on with some temporary success. When Diocletian (reigned 284-304) was reminded by one of his generals of a promise he had made, that if victorious he would wreak vengeance upon the Christians, he found it expedient for the purpose of keeping the court party together to carry out that promise, although he would rather have broken it. But he realized the importance, nevertheless, of procuring divine sanction for so terrific an enterprise. A pilgrimage was accordingly conducted to the ancient shrine of Apollo at Delphi, and a favorable response elicited from the rustling leaves as a warrant for the disciplinary measure about to be inflicted. Constantine (reigned 306-337) for practical reasons made Christianity the religion of the Empire. Julian the Apostate (reigned 361-363), who learned the teaching of Christianity at Athens, made up his mind when he assumed the royal purple that Christianity would not work as a state religion. His decision was purely political and thoroughly practical. More people had faith in Apollo than in the new faith; and so during his reign the Roman world returned for a brief time to its political paganism.

The doctrine of life in the politics of the mediæval ages was obedience to the Church. It also carried the duty to perform exploits. It appeared in the deeds of chivalry and

more particularly in the crusades which appealed greatly to a society filled, as western Europe was, with fighting men.

In politics, the pagan renaissance took the form of a kind of statecraft famous for its hypocrisy. Read what Niccolo Machiavelli wrote under the title "Ought Princes to Keep Their Promises". He says:

> A prince should earnestly endeavor to gain the reputation of kindness, clemency, piety, justice, and fidelity to his engagements. He ought to possess all these good qualities, but still retain such power over himself as to display their opposites whenever it may be expedient. I maintain that a prince, and especially a new prince, cannot with impunity exercise all the virtues, because his own self-preservation will often compel him to violate the laws of charity, religion, and humanity. He should habituate himself to bend easily to the various circumstances which may from time to time surround him.
>
> Let it then be the prince's chief care to maintain his authority; the means he employs, be they what they may, will, for this purpose, always appear honorable and meet applause.

This advice upon how to attain perfection in the art of perfidy was more than an isolated expression of opinion. It was a part of the political reasoning of the times. The writer had been engaged in diplomatic missions, and was entirely familiar with the politics of the small Italian states, and their relationship with France and Germany. In practice this reasoning appears in the dealings of great statesmen: in the correspondence of Philip II; in the art of Richelieu and Mazarin; at the court of Henry VIII and of Queen Elizabeth.

It would be hard to say which monarch treated the Netherlands in a more two-faced manner,—Philip of Spain or Queen Elizabeth. They departed from the advice of the Italian essayist only in being less skilful than Machiavelli advised. Pages could be written in illustration of the Machiavellian policy. Shakespeare portrayed it in his works; best in Macbeth, where ruin follows upon the heels of success, promised by fate and secured by perfidy.

Far less difficult is it to trace the practice of double-dealing conducted as a sound and orderly policy, than to

follow the thread of thought which bore fruit in Swedenborg's exposition of the doctrine of life. The Reformation was a chapter in the independent spirit of the renaissance. Its impulse, while religious in form, was political in fact. It did, however, lay the foundation for the inspired insight of Swedenborg. I find John Calvin, in his writings called the "Institutes", groping toward something coherent in a discussion of the freedom of the will. He says:

> In his upright state man possessed freedom of the will, by which if he chose he was able to obtain eternal life. But those who, while they profess to be the disciples of Christ, seek for free-will in man, notwithstanding his being lost and crowned in spiritual destruction, labor under a manifold delusion.

From this is may be gathered that, according to Calvin, after Adam yielded to temptation, the exercise of free-will vanished from the earth.

John Calvin did not express himself as well as did St. Augustine, who, over eleven hundred years before, in his work on the kingdom of God, exclaimed that he who is good is free, though he be a slave, and he that is evil is a slave, though he be king. To St. Thomas Aquinas life has two meanings: the active which is busied with many things, and therefore less happy; and the contemplative, which is occupied with an understanding of the truth.

Swedenborg touched the formalism of ages and gave it a new meaning. The word "good" had caused endless confusion. Swedenborg analyzed the meaning of the word, and said that it was threefold,—civil, moral and spiritual. Civil good is what a man does from the law of the land. According to it, a man is a citizen in the natural world. Moral good is what a man does from the law of reason. According to this good, he is a person living in the natural world. Spiritual good is that which a man does from spiritual law. According to this good, a man is a citizen in the spiritual world. The distinction is of great importance in the interest of clearness, for we are to learn from it the value to be attached to the good a man does. Good to be

of most value must be spiritual, therefore from the Lord. The moral and civil good which come from man himself are of less value; they must be derived from spiritual good to be genuine.

A further distinction still more important now appears. Under the old theology, men of themselves are expected to distinguish between good and evil. This reduces the choice to natural planes. But Swedenborg lifts the exercise of choice to the higher plane. The choice is therefore not one of expediency but of steadfast spiritual purpose. In other words, such a choice means that both the understanding and the will should be put to work harmoniously in the spiritual mind. That is what Swedenborg means when he says that evils should be shunned as sins. By evils he designates separate cases of the class of evils. By sins he designates all misdeeds in the sight of the Lord. To combat evils on the natural plane is to oppose some and to accept others. To combat evils on the spiritual plane is to oppose them all. Therefore to exercise freedom of the will, there must take place a conscious effort to select the spiritual plane as the field for the choice.

The clarifying effect of the foregoing reasoning is revolutionary. Through it we are to see that in the period of the Most Ancient Church the will and the understanding co-operated with the least effort, probably with no conscious effort upon the spiritual plane.

In the Ancient Period, the will but not the understanding had sunk to a low level of activity upon the natural plane. The force of Christianity was directed toward restoring the will and the understanding to coordinate positions. Through the operation of this force there arose a mighty conflict of ideas, which is going on even today. It is a conflict which Emerson described as the story which the hours tell against the minutes. It is the teaching of reality in Swedenborg's doctrine of life against the school of appearances as expounded by Machiavelli. Shakespeare expresses the thought thus:

> The world is still deceived by ornament.
> In law, what plea so tainted and corrupt
> But, being seasoned with a gracious voice,
> Obscures the show of evil? In religion,
> What damned error, but some sober brow
> Will bless it and approve it with a text. . . ?
> There is no vice so simple but assumes
> Some mark of virtue on his outward parts.

This indeed was not so in the times of the Most Ancient Church. There was no room for a doctrine of life, for life in its simplicity was real. It was lived without conscious effort. Explanations arose when the Most Ancient Church vanished from the earth. Philosophy appeared. A school of theology developed. Appearances were accepted as sufficient. It was a world of appearances which Swedenborg sought to correct with reasoning and with revelation. He summoned both science and religion in aid of the truth.

Now truth is one thing, and what people think about truth is quite another. Every person pretends to like the truth. But not every person really likes it. The public always likes the truth. That is why public opinion is sometimes very different from private opinion. In the Most Ancient Church everybody must have known the truth intuitively. Afterwards appearances were accepted for truth. A successful policy was accordingly approved as a truthful policy. If what passed for a doctrine of life was not sufficient to distinguish between appearance and reality, then there was no effective public opinion.

It is only recently in the march of time that public opinion has been directed toward private enterprise. Public opinion has been mainly concerned with public business. But the civilizations of modern times have discovered that private business is colored with a public interest. The discovery has not yet reached its ultimate results. Because there is a long road ahead, there is still quite a body of opinion that private business is conducted with more honesty and more efficiency than public business. Actually there is less public opinion and less publicity about private busi-

ness; and that is absolutely all the difference. Inasmuch as public opinion is founded upon a certain conception of the truth, it has exercised a steadying influence upon public affairs. This steadying influence is still lacking in private affairs. When somebody says that business is business, he means that a decision is being made which at least does not rise above that which is civil and moral, and perhaps falls far beneath that level on the natural plane. To appeal for public support upon this bald platform would be an invitation to disaster.

I sometimes hear it said that some enterprise or another should be kept out of politics. Keep it out of politics, and you keep public opinion away from it. In time, so far as America is concerned, nothing will be kept out of politics. When railroads, insurance companies, telephone, gas, and electric lighting companies got into politics, we began to know more about them. Today these activities and many others are like branches of the government. In fact government has made such strides into private affairs that it is by no means certain that they will not presently be as widely opened to public scrutiny as any operations of government. It is not always easy nowadays to draw the line which separates business from politics. This does not mean, however, that politicians will become business men, or that business men will become politicians.

Now, there is nothing more pathetic than the care-free assumption of the average successful business man that he was born a politician. This assumption has been responsible for many a short and tragic career. Mercantile operations certainly have their political aspect, and political undertakings have their business aspect. But a private undertaking is conducted for the purpose of declaring dividends, and a public undertaking is conducted for the purpose of performing certain public services without profit. The former may take advantage of favorable turns in the market. The latter is called upon to perform its work no matter what the market may be. The former enjoys free-

dom of contract. The latter is restricted by the requirements of public law. The former selects its employees. The latter takes what the civil service rules provide. Generally private enterprise may do anything not forbidden by law. But the public may do nothing except with the express sanction of law. It must wait on its authority for every public act. And through all, government acts under a glare of publicity, and amid the ebb and flow of public opinion.

In private affairs the doctrine of life touches upon the relationship of individuals with each other as individuals. But in public affairs it touches upon the relationship of individuals with themselves in a collective unit.

There was once a reason for the pall of mystery that hung over political deliberations. We had the political cynicism of the Machiavellian school; and long after its author had passed away Talleyrand in his pungent way expressed its height of political thinking by his famous remark that language was given us to conceal our thoughts. Walter Raleigh had published the same thought in his caustic stanza:

> Tell men of high condition,
> That manage the estate,
> Their purpose is ambition,
> Their practice only hate:
> And if they once reply,
> Then give them all the lie.

There is less reason for any mystery now, although ambition, hatred, and self-interest play their part in politics about as they do in business. Our times, however, are not times of mystery. Have you listened to what political candidates have to say about each other over the radio and in the papers? Is there anything left for the imagination? Never before have there been so many avenues of spreading information. People are alert for facts. Heaven knows they do not always get what they want; and fortunately they do not believe all they hear. But when in the history of civilization was there a time when tens of thousands got

such a bombardment of news? The volume of publicity in a single day would swamp all the political discussion of ancient Rome. And it does not halt at election. The personal habits of the successful candidate, the hobbies of the members of his family, his views on every political, economic, social, and personal question are analyzed, expanded, contracted, checked, and recorded. He has no more seclusion than an exhibit in the aquarium. Maybe he likes it. Maybe not. The result is the same. And every person with any effective interest in politics lives the same kind of life the year round.

Propaganda plays an enormous part in the politics of today. It touches every conceivable topic. Every candidate and every political party is subjected to its pressure. We think in terms of majority rule; but where minorities are well organized, they are highly successful. The most conspicuous example of minority rule in the world is the Soviet, where the grip of a few hundred thousand holds millions upon millions in subjection. Where there is apathy, minorities win. No one can afford to remain apathetic, when subtle talk is being made against our free institutions.

I cannot exaggerate the profound influence that women have today in our political life. Their discussions reach every phase of political activity, and their grasp of affairs and their energy is astonishing. I regard the activity of women's clubs, which meet with huge attendance every day in the week, as a distinctive feature of modern political life.

There are many kinds of politicians. Some are regular, some contrary, some occasional, some accidental, some special. The regular knows that the party can promote no measure without party success, and he writes the platform accordingly. The contrary wants to be in, but is out or on the way out. The occasional is here today and gone tomorrow. The accidental discovers that greatness has been thrust upon him. The special hugs an issue, and is a prom-

ising purveyor of propaganda. You find him talking before the committee on resolutions. Perhaps he is fanatical, perhaps reasonable. Not infrequently he represents a lively issue upon which the election may depend. This issue, whatever it may be, has long been the talk of women's clubs, neighborhood clubs, church clubs, social clubs, boards of trade, chambers of commerce, reform associations, street-corner gatherings. It has become crystallized into a couple of fighting ideas. Somebody must soon decide whether to take sides, and which side to take.

A political machine is not the source of political power. It often walks in front of the procession, but is not leading it. The machine consults rather than commands. It does not create public opinion, but registers it. The power is not in the machine. It is in the ebb and flow of opinion.

Our political institutions grew out of an issue framed by public opinion. One idea distrusted the power of the people. The other idea sought to extend it. Both ideas have contributed to the structure; but emphatically it is the many who tell the few what they want.

We send representatives to the Legislature and to Congress theoretically to exercise their best judgment. And judgment is best exercised when it does not misunderstand the sentiment back home. Democracy still advances with seven league boots. People are not contented with uncertainty. They want everything positive, concrete, and tangible. Middle ground on a sharp issue like prohibition is an invitation to political disaster. And to a great extent so is any ground, wet or dry, until the question hardens.

In this essay I am concerned with phenomena. I give no advice upon how people should act in the conduct of their affairs. While there is a popular demand for that which is certain, and an aversion for that which is shifty or evasive, I am aware that the two most fundamental questions before the nation are in no-man's-land. Our foreign policy has not yet reached a standard acceptable to the American people, and all of our domestic policies are involved in the

struggle for power between the federal government and the states.

There are points of view, idealistic and practical, on each side of these questions. But while the world still belongs to Caesar, it has surely gone a long way beyond accepting Machiavelli's doctrine of duplicity. The only reason that that doctrine ever had any success was not because multitudes enjoyed double-dealing better than square-dealing, but because their condition was such that they did not think much about it. Now they do. When the issue is clear, the public opinion is moral. When the issue is clouded, public opinion still errs. But when public opinion is moral, it has an intensity that suggests strongly the presence of a spiritual quality.

In the time of Swedenborg the term "mass psychology" was unknown. His writings had reference to the degeneracy of that eighteenth century period which turned his thoughts toward the universal significance of human life; but the problem he touched upon was more definitely the relationship of the thoughts and affections of the individual. It was the operation of the mind upon different planes of action. One of the two elements of the human mind, the understanding, might be on the spiritual plane, while the other, the will, might be on the natural plane. And it is the will that controls the understanding.

Proceeding into the complex avenues of political thinking, we now approach a dilemma of progress. For if public opinion or mass thinking tends toward the moral and the spiritual, we should expect political action to show the same tendency to the same degree. Unfortunately, however, the political issues of the day are presented on the natural plane in the way and manner in which it appears to the person or persons who present them that they are best suited to the prevailing public opinion. The public looks through the eyes of the individual. So far as I know there has never been a political issue where the public could decide that all the right was on one side and all the wrong

was on the other. Slavery never appeared in a form that could be answered by a yes or a no. Temperance and prohibition are for some not the same thing at all. Many people are free traders in theory and protectionists in practice. Pacifism does not mean peace on earth. Bolshevism is not the same thing as democracy. Freedom is one thing, and license another. While people grope for something to pray for, often the best they get is something to swear at. The mind of the multitude always seems to be in one place, and the understanding in another.

Added to mass psychology is the presence of the machine age whose effect upon public opinion is to sharpen the force of public questions.

Thinking under these circumstances becomes mechanical, formalistic, cramped, and specialized. There is a ready-made answer for everything. Sob sisters dissect our emotions. Every newspaper story must now be written by a specialist. Every novel is built upon some peculiar chemistry of passion. Life is made to hop from one wise crack to another. People gape in amazement, which they confuse with admiration, before a painting which looks as much like art as an explosion in a shingle factory. It would be strange if politics were not affected in such wise as to lend plausibility to the whimsical epigram that politics is the art of diagnosing trouble incorrectly and applying the wrong remedy.

I would not have you think there is no reaction from the fantastic and the grotesque. What we see is extremely deceptive. It is the appearance of life which does indeed influence the acts and opinions of the day. But its superficial play of impulses is wanting in the depth and coherency necessary to give it endurance. Behind it all there is a genuine love of home and country that in time will turn it all to some good account. The things that are wild and freakish are signs of trouble. There is much trouble in the world, no doubt about it. And trouble has real value in its capacity to strengthen faith. Popular will cannot make

human agency spiritual; but when backed by faith, it can and does compel through the least promising individual agent a tolerably good performance. In this sense the will of the multitude exercises some control over the misunderstanding of its members, although the two tend toward different planes.

Swedenborg's doctrine of life is not yet in the high place it ought to have of conscious acceptance. Many persons who consult fortune tellers shrink from revelation. But to learn from Swedenborg, one need rely on neither one source nor the other. For nobody gifted with common sense can read Swedenborg without receiving insight into a reasonable and comprehensible explanation of the divine order, and how human conduct may be served by a better understanding of it. This is a view on the natural plane of the Second Coming, the vision of which may be lost in the passing of a summer storm only to sweep across the heavens with the rainbow of promise.

There are great idealists as well as great materialists in politics. The pendulum for centuries has swung between the dreams of Plato and the facts of Aristotle. Until Swedenborg appeared, nobody had presented anything like a reconciliation of the two schools of thought. And it may be that in more democracy the harmony of the ideal and the practical will find highest expression.

Malcolm E. Nichols.

USES OF THE SCRIPTURES' INTERNAL SENSE

By Leslie Marshall

THAT an exposition of the internal, or spiritual, sense of the Word has a definite this-world use appears obvious to the New-Churchman, if only from the single circumstance that Swedenborg's illumination of the Scriptures was given to *this* world. On the other hand, one who is but newly finding his way to Swedenborg will at first neither appreciate the *fact* of the existence of the Word's internal meaning, nor understand the significance of securing a first-hand knowledge of what that meaning is.

If the inquirer's interest is sustained, first of all he may ask, "What *use* has the internal meaning you tell me of, over and above the use of the meaning all good people find in the Bible?" This paper will endeavor to answer that question, proceeding first to demonstrate the primary proposition that there *is* an "internal sense" in the Word.

It is a matter of history, that at one period in the life of the Old Testament Scriptures there arose allegorists, as we may think of them, who claimed for the Sacred Writings a definitely formulated "inner" or "double" meaning. Pointing to passages of Scripture that do not readily disclose their literal sense, or even to the Book as a whole, symbolizers have attached explanations to them often as fanciful as the motives prompting the effort. Search for the higher, or deeper, meaning the allegorist might; but he would have to look for it on a more spiritual level—in a different sphere as it were—than that of an interpretation obviously shining from the letter. At the same time, the importance of the literal sense of the Word is not to be minimized in any consideration of the manner by which the deeper meaning is disclosed; in that undertaking the letter is at once a ladder and guide.

Opening the way to our thoughts concerning the existence of the spiritual sense, we quote Swedenborg:

> Few can believe that there is in the Word an internal sense which does not at all shine forth from the letter. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 1984.)
>
> There is such a sense in everything of the Word, not only in the prophetical, but in the historical parts. (*Ibid.*, n. 2310.)

The Theological Works likewise point out that even among this "few" there must still be fruitful individual religious experience before the significance of the internal sense's relation to the spiritual life is really understood or made a part of the man. No doubt this fact prompted Swedenborg to inscribe the following Scripture on the fly-leaf or title-page of volumes of his "Arcana Cœlestia" and other works:

> Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you. (Matt. vi, 33.)

And in the "True Christian Religion," n. 244, we read:

> The things which lie hid in the spiritual sense are not apparent except to those who love truths because they are truths, and do good because they are goods.

At the outset, one cannot help admitting at least the reasonableness of the claim for a deeper sense in Scripture. Certainly, passage after passage appears to need a great deal more light than the authorities are able to throw on them. Indeed, whole chapters or larger sections may seem wholly beyond the explanation of most Bible students. Further, whereas all Christians designate the Scriptures, and profess to deem them, the Word of the Lord, nevertheless they are forced to act on the recognition that the Bible contains statements which in the bare letter appear so gross as often to prohibit their reading in public, or discussion in private. But if the Word is the Lord's, as is admitted, then it is holy in all respects. This forces the conclusion that it must be holy from within; that is, the internal sense infills the letter, giving it power and light, so that it may be said:

> Divine truth . . . is not holy until it is in its ultimate, which is the Word in the sense of the letter. (Apocalypse Explained, n. 1088.)

Again, that there is deeper meaning in Scripture than is apparent in the letter of it, seems obvious if only from the evident fact that the Bible, as so many words, is an ultimated expression of God's Mind. That is, the Word, the *Logos,* the Divine Truth, must have existed—to think in time terms—unknowable ages before writing was known in this world, so that the Word is not to be confined to, nor merged in, even the highest literal expression of it. Here, at once, we remember John 1:1. Looking at Scripture in this way, we avoid limiting God and the Truth proceeding from Him. Thus it follows, as Swedenborg declares, that no angel or mortal can attain to the highest comprehension of Truth. "There shall no man see Me and live" (Ex. xxxiii, 20).

We find still another reason for concluding that the Word has an internal sense, when we observe that Scripture consistently uses terms and general words to signify certain states and elements of spiritual life. Such recurrences may be traced easily enough by means of the references in the margins of many Bibles, or by use of a concordance. "Rock" is a word immediately thought of in this connection. The invariable significance of "east" in both Old and New Testaments will also come to mind. Granting the oriental turn of speech, we should need to press on beyond that as an explanation, if a deeper spiritual significance for "rock" and "east"—in their particular context—is doubted. To take one more interesting example,—one will find a serpent consistently used throughout the Word to represent a certain evil state. Its slimy trail runs through the Word from Genesis to Revelation; so that in the first Book and in the last Book of the Bible as we have it today, in the face of the long ages intervening in their oral and written transition, and despite the utter difference between the languages of the originals and the dissimilarity in their settings, an

unbroken thread of meaning has been conveyed. God is there making His Mind known in the picture-language all can understand. Bearing this in mind, is not one compelled to admit that the same law bearing on the obvious words we have selected also rules in the case of all other words?

With this attempt to demonstrate that there *is* an internal sense in the Word, we pass on to the effort to treat of what this sense consists in.

Swedenborg says:

> Both in general and in particular (it) bears reference to the Lord, to his heaven, to the Church, to religious belief, and to all things connected therewith. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 1.)
>
> The internal sense deals with the regeneration of the man of the Church . . . because the regeneration of man is a representative image of the glorification of the Lord. (*Ibid.*, n. 6827.)

Why should it be said that the internal sense of the Word is of this character?

> (This) might be known from the single consideration that, being the Lord's and from the Lord, it must of necessity contain within it such things (as stated above, n. 1) . . . Unless it did so it could not be called the Lord's Word. (*Ibid.*, n. 2.)

We may say, then, that in general the theme of the spiritual sense is three-fold: (1) illumination of the course of development of the inner life of the Lord; (2) disclosure of the spiritual history of the race; (3) description of the spiritual development of the individual. Proceeding with the first of these, and making our start with the opening Book of the Word, we first shall have to answer the question, "By what Scripture authority can the claim be made that Genesis deals with the life of the Lord Jesus Christ?" "To all intents," the questioner might continue, "there is no reference to the Lord of the New Testament in that Book, unless one makes the reputed exception of Gen. iii, 15." Confined to the sense of the letter of Genesis, that might appear to be the case; but additional evidence of an internal sense is to be found, for the Lord is recorded in Luke xxiv, 27 and 44, and in iv, 21, as referring his listeners not

only to all the Books of Moses for "all things concerning Himself," but to other parts of the Old Testament Word. Another very definite passage in the same connection is to be found in John v, 39: "Ye search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which bear witness concerning me"; also in verse 46: "Moses . . . wrote of me".

Enlightened, spiritually-minded thinkers since very early days have apparently recognized, certainly in the Psalms and Prophets, the force of the Lord's words as above quoted; but with the exception of Swedenborg I know of no one who has attempted to give a systematic exposition of what the Lord meant concerning the Pentateuch. Scripture allegorists—as we have said—there have been, from the days of Philo, and before; but there seems neither consistency nor spirituality of a very high order in the results of their efforts. They may have lacked, too, the purity of mind and motive necessary in dealing with so exalted a task.

Very apparently, the course of the development of the Lord's inner life is not to be found in the letter of Scripture. We must go higher, deeper. The findings are given the convenient designation of "the internal sense"; and without doubt the setting forth of this meaning for three whole Books of the Word serves Swedenborg, aside from other considerations, to demonstrate the existence of such a sense.

To prove or support its second proposition, this paper can do no less than follow as best it can the spiritual sense as unfolded by Swedenborg; and the paper can do more than proceed a very short distance in that direction. At the same time as the effort is made to trace in the heavenly meaning of Scripture somewhat of the Lord's inner life on this earth, there will be the attempt to glimpse, on the lower plane, the spiritual development of the individual.

We shall make a start with Genesis xii. Here, "Abraham's call" may be perceived to be a perfect representation,

in historical pattern, of the Divine promptings from within which led the little Lord Jesus to the realization of the necessity of leaving, or putting off, the more worldly or corporeal things, in order that in due course He might see, —that is, there might be unfolded in Him,—the more divine things signified by the going into Canaan. It is a land "flowing with milk and honey." The Prophet says, "Butter and honey shall he eat" (Is. vii, 15).

Now we see Abram, Sarai, and Lot moving from Haran, where the worship was idolatrous (the things of the world), into Canaan, where they stop at Shechem,—a word which in general signifies the "beginnings" or "outer." From this outpost, the patriarch and his family travel to the mountains near Bethel. Thus, as the Lord represented by Abram, advanced into more exalted states,—signified, of course, by the mountains,—He came still closer to His true habitation of God (Beth-el). We perceive the same to be the case with man, in a limited degree. As infants, we appear helpless; even the sensuous is little developed; but the purely corporeal things, and a sort of idolatry of them,—in that we know no better than to desire food, sleep, etc.,—must be transcended, if the spiritual life is to be developed and sustained.

Journeying on (v. 10), we are told, "There was a famine in the land, and Abram went down into Egypt." Very often are the great figures of Scripture spoken of as being in "Egypt." With its ample fields, fed by the waters of the Nile through an excellent system of irrigation, the country was ever a picture of plenty to the ancients. In such a region, too, was genius and science likely to be encouraged; and for centuries before the period with which we are dealing, Egypt had been a center of civilization and learning. Looking deeper than the literal account of a patriarch travelling with his family to another country in order to have "plenty to eat," we shall see represented in the story the circumstance that the boy Jesus, just as Matthew records it, must needs go into Egypt. He must be instructed

even in natural truths before His mission could begin. Obviously, boyhood and youth, with all men, are periods of instruction. During that time character begins to form; it is all preparatory to life out in the world of practical, if not spiritual, affairs.

We know almost nothing of the Lord's every-day life; but among the few fragmentary statements in the Gospels, is Luke's important testimony that "the child grew . . . filled with wisdom" (ii, 40). But soon influences entered to hinder Him (v, 11). The natural desire for knowledge, more particularly of the manner in which His mission must be carried out, threatened the supremacy of the growing consciousness of the purpose of His task. This is the deeper meaning of the story of Sarai's willingness to pose as Abram's sister, during the sojourn in Egypt. It is well that the desire, and even the need, for natural knowledges, should be independently exercised in order to be attained,—"entreated well" by the Egyptians. Then, in the instance of the Lord, Sarai can be joined to her husband again. But it is not always so in the case of man. His love of securing knowledge may wholly obscure the need for putting the truth to use in a love for the neighbor and in a hope to be useful to the world in general. At all events, one will observe that it is profitable to perceive a deeper import in this Scripture than the bare account of Abram's fear that the beauty of his sixty-four years old wife might turn the head of a Pharoah and his court. And there is more to be seen than the patriarch's decision to attempt so strange a deception in his old age.

When the danger of truth's separation from good—the husband separated from the wife—becomes too deadly, Abram and Sarai go forth from Egypt. This was as soon as plagues came upon Pharoah because Sarai remained. But the purpose has been served; Abram departs with riches. Man, too, is enriched today, if there is a right balance between the things of the heart and those of the head.

It is thus that the spiritual life is developed. From Egypt we must push on to Canaan.

At chapter xii the story of Abram and Lot tells us in its deeper sense of the separation from the Lord, not only of the lower and undeveloped things of the intellect, as related in the previous chapter, but of the more exterior things of the will and purpose; or they may be thought of as relating to the senses, or sensuous life,—that is, such elements of such states as are inconsistent with the Divine. Again, the new start, as it were, is from Bethel (v. 3). The Lord perceives that there are states in his external life which must be separated from the Divine in Him. "The land was not able to bear them that they might dwell together" (v. 6). "And there was strife between (them)" (v. 7). Particularly at this period in the life of youth is there likely to be "strife"; for, as Swedenborg says, "Evil has nothing into which it may operate or flow, except learning and knowledge" (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 1573). We eat of the tree of knowledge, and would become as gods. Principles instilled and cherished while in the home circle, particularly by means of the Word, are called in question,—perhaps lost sight of at this period, after the return from "Egypt."

Chapter xiv, with its account of the "battle of the kings," —Abram's struggles with these kings, and his defeat and pursuit of them,—is representative of the Lord's temptations and combats which come as the result of the "rebellion," upon which we touched in the preceding paragraph. This is a state, too, often in evidence about the "thirteenth year," as the Scripture places it. But the Lord had the power to bring the lower things into subjection to Him; and we see the "king of Sodom" admitting defeat and submitting himself (v. 17). Also, as represented by Abram, the Lord brings back his "brother" from his captors. Lot, representing the Lord's human, shall not be held in bondage by evil. After this victory, comes a consolation, or peace, represented by Melchizedek, "king of Salem" (Uru-Salim,

city of peace). Says Swedenborg at this point in his exposition of the deeper sense of Genesis:

> When a man is in the combats of temptation, he is by turns gifted by the Lord with a state of peace and thus refreshed. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 1726.)

Reluctantly leaving this beautiful story, we must now speak of the second and remaining of the three themes which are unfolded in the deeper meaning of Genesis and Exodus. Looking into the question of the spiritual state manifested by the prehistoric races, we shall be guided by the internal sense in chapters earlier than those we have been considering. It is Genesis i to xi with which we shall be concerned now, especially chapter i, where the spiritual life is dealt with from its lowest state, "without form and void," to an order of things, where, as a race, there is a perception of the heavenly. This—as we proceed into chapter ii—is not corrupted until the love of self and love of the world become the universal order. In the immediately succeeding chapters, there is a story, in the deeper sense, of the ebb and flow of the spiritual race; each time the tide seems to recede further from the heavenly short. Now, as ages—or Churches, as Swedenborg terms them—succeed one another, we are at Exodus, with those in the spiritual order of heaven, as distinguished from the celestial, pressed about by the growing forces of evil. The "children of Israel" are in bondage. Again the setting is "Egypt." The race is unable to rise above its desire for knowledge, or understanding, pertaining to natural things. Into this state, as has been quoted, Swedenborg says evil flows; and it is evil that binds. "Satan has bound you." Thus in the story of the release of Israel from captivity, and of its exodus, we have in the inner meaning an account of man's redemption by the Lord. The Two Books signify a covenant, as do the Two Tables. The Lord supremely fulfills His part in the overcoming of the hellish states pressing about the heavens, endeavoring to choke the influx of good to the world; and

so He delivers man, that he may work out his salvation in freedom.

To the inquirer who has sought evidence of the existence of the internal sense, and who has followed its unfolding through Genesis, the parallel, or, better still, the correspondence between the spiritual sense and the natural sense as unfolded in Exodus, is in many ways more simple to follow than, say, the "creation" story in Genesis. I suppose that the Exodus story may be said to tell specifically of the redemption effected by the Lord at the time of His First Coming; and in general it is concerning the redemption He effects at any coming.

Proceeding now to a brief summary of a few earlier chapters of Exodus, in our effort to show additional grounds for the existence of a three-fold theme in the deeper meaning, we observe in the darkened state of the Israelites in Egypt a glow of light, as a Moses is born to lead his people forth. The stubbornness of the king when faced by Moses and Aaron, the works of magic at that time, the succeeding plagues, give us a representative glimpse of the hellish forces opposing the Lord as His mission began (and begins) to bear fruit. Inevitably, the spiritual life is freed—as was previously indicated—from restraints against which man, of himself, is powerless. And now at last the Israelites can go forth. But their responsibility is no less than before. Soon the first glamor of release wears off. There is doubt, rebellion, idolatry, selfishness of the grossest kind,—all of it only too clearly picturing the life of the individual in any age and nation. And yet, hear Moses:

> The Lord thy God is a merciful God; he will not forsake thee, nor forget the covenant of thy fathers which he sware unto them . . . If . . . thou shalt seek the Lord thy God, thou shalt find him; if thou seek him with all thy heart and with all thy soul. (Deut. iv, 29, 31.)

We leave this immediate aspect of the subject with an interesting statement which Swedenborg makes in illuminat-

ing the situation, and which at the same time serves as a golden link between the meanings of Genesis and Exodus:

> That the glorification of the Lord is on account of liberation . . . [and] that they who were of the spiritual church were saved solely by the coming of the Lord . . . [has been shown above] (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 8261.)

If in any degree a case has been made for the existence of a deeper meaning in Scripture, we now are to show that even an awareness of the internal sense, together with the insights resulting from some understanding of what that involves, has a practical, every-day use, helping us fulfil our responsibility to God and to the neighbor.

Of course, we must not overlook the fact that, after all, the supreme service the internal sense renders lies in its unfoldment of the development of the course of the Lord's inner life. In his text-book, "Christian Thought since Kant," E. C. Moore, Professor of Theology in Harvard University, asks, "How did even Christ's great soul react, experience, work, will and suffer? By what possible means can we ever know how He reacted, worked, willed, suffered? . . . We must inquire of our own souls" (p. 240). One may contend with reason that the true answer to Professor Moore's question is to be found in the Word, though it is true enough that man must experience the spiritual life, in order to understand the Word's answer,—if that is what the statement "inquire of our own souls" means.

Proceeding with the "practical use" aspect of our proposition, it may be helpful first to note what the Theological Works have to say on an important point in this connection:

> It is principally that sense [the spiritual] which makes the Word spiritual, not only for men, but also for the angels; and therefore the Word by that sense communicates with the heavens. (True Christian Religion, n. 194.)

From this it is evident that the realization of the existence of a deeper sense in Scripture means much in the way of directing a man to the path of regeneration, and helping him on the way. Surely, the increasing recognition of the

fact of a wholly Divine Word, limitlessly above or beyond the written Scripture, its human expression, and yet here at hand, will give most people a love and respect for the Bible which will lead them more and more to study it.

Indeed, to this writer the explanation for the seeming strength and growth of today's leading healing cult lies in its love for the Bible, and in its insistence that the letter of Scripture contains a spiritual sense. The same realization should afford anyone a wholly new conception of the *power* of the Word. Its use in worship and in private reading takes on added significance, viewed in this way. The Book is something more than *a book*. In it there is a perfect correspondence between the spiritual and natural: therefore it is written, "In Thy Light we see light" (Ps. xxxvi, 9).

Thinking of other uses the internal sense may serve in everyday life, there comes to mind an interesting statement this writer heard Professor William F. Wunsch, of the New-Church Theological School, make in a lecture not long since. He pointed out that a knowledge of the internal sense would be of inestimable use to the person seeking to develop in the psychology of religion an answer to such a question as, "When does the power of the Lord act first on a soul?" One cannot take such a question as this into the laboratory or library and expect to find his answer in test-tube or tome. The investigator's own thought must be elevated to deal with so exalted a subject. He must see that between the natural and spiritual there is a discrete degree. Supplementary supplies of oxygen are found useless at great heights, as many an aviator has discovered; to be unlimitedly successful he would need supplies of the same atmosphere as that he was seeking to penetrate. Prophetic and illuminating is Swedenborg:

> Whatever of the apparent wisdom does not make one with the love of wisdom, falls back into the love which does make one with it. (Divine Love and Wisdom, n. 39.)

It is apparent, then, that the seeker for an answer to the question above stated would, as he found his way to his

response through the letter of Scripture, not only enhance the knowledge or technique of his science, but inevitably raise the plane of his own spiritual life. This situation, multiplied, would surely make a powerful impression for good on the world of religious and scientific thought—to say nothing of the general benefit.

We can appreciate, too, something of the value of a knowledge of the internal sense to the clergyman, busy about his pastoral duties. In a somewhat different relation, we can think of the use of the deeper meaning to the social worker in case work. Many a life which thinks itself doomed to failure could be vivified and detached from hopeless materiality, if some light—in such a case probably the force of logic—could be thrown on the life to be lived hereafter, or (on definite reasons) for the necessity of a "this-life". Certainly, as has been referred to elsewhere in this paper, the proof of the existence of the inner sense also proves a reason for the acceptance of the Bible as consequential—a by no means accepted fact with many individuals the pastor will be in touch with.

Our thoughts in connection with this particular proposition have been rather confined to the use of the internal sense to the individual. In a more universal respect we see that the same understanding will be effective in the Christian world at large. Daily, at its opening session, the Word is read or quoted in Congress at its convening prayers. Officials in many departments of public life are introduced into office with an oath taken on the Word. The Sacred Book is read in the schools of many sections of the country. Courts swear their witnesses on the Word; everywhere it represents the presence of the Lord.

Recognizing the importance of this attitude insofar as it is reverential, how much greater might be the in-pouring and out-pouring of truth, whatever the situation, were the existence of a wholly deeper sense within the Word realized and acted upon!

LESLIE MARSHALL.

THE GIFT OF THE MOUNTAINS

By Asa E. Goddard

WE all love the mountains. If we spend a little time in considering what they mean to us in a very literal sense, it will be a great help in understanding their deeper signification in the Scriptures.

First of all, their beauty and grandeur appeal to us with such force that they afford an inspiration, and call out a feeling of reverence so overpowering as to eclipse all their other uses. Their height and majesty made people of the old days consider them the habitation of their gods, or even identify them with the gods themselves.

Before considering their more commonplace uses, let us give a little thought to the method of their formation. The primary cause of every great mountain system is a folding or wrinkling up of the earth's crust, due to a shrinkage of the interior as the result of cooling, loss of gases, etc. In the course of millions of years these folds are lifted high enough to attract the agencies which carve the separate peaks, and which ultimately destroy the mountains themselves. In the process of folding sufficient heat is developed to change essentially the character of the rocks. The core, or axis, of the range has usually been fused and solidified again as granite; above this, sandstone has been metamorphosed into quartzite, limestone into marble, clays and shales into slate, bituminous coal into anthracite or even into graphite. A large part of the wealth of Vermont consists of the durable rocks hardened by the uplift of the Appalachian range.

But these great rock quarries are not the only gift of the mountains. The disintegrated particles either build up the fertile valleys so necessary for our crops, or are carried

along by successive stages to the ocean, to be sorted over and ultimately to form new beds of rock, destined perhaps in remote ages to form another mountain system.

As mountains grow in height, or as we go up them, climate changes. The elevation of Mount Washington is sufficient to change a moderate temperature at the lower levels to an Arctic climate at the upper. Hardier varieties of flowers and trees, hardier animals, yes, and hardier and more freedom-loving men, are found in the mountainous sections of the globe.

We know that the word "John" means the gift of God. The character of the Apostle John was a wonderful gift to the world; but how immeasurably greater it appears when we think of what was given *through* John,—the Gospel of John, the Epistles of John, the Apocalypse. So it is with the mountains. Countless blessings come to us through the agency of the mountains. The dews, clouds, rains, snow and ice of the mountains, are the sources of practically all of our permanent streams, and of many of our most beautiful lakes and ponds. The water supplies for cities and towns, for irrigating the fields, for furnishing power both directly and indirectly to run our mills, to light and heat both factories and homes, may be traced to the mountains.

To summarize briefly,—we are indebted to the mountains for inspiration, a reverential spirit, a broader and more accurate view; for protection; and indirectly to a large extent for food, drink, clothing, habitations, and power.

From a multitude of passages in Swedenborg's writings we learn that the meaning of mountains is love. In the supreme sense, a mountain stands for the Lord Himself; for God is love. Since our love to the Lord and to the neighbor are but the reflection of His love, a mountain in a subordinate sense is the "good of love," or love in action, the motive power of the world, the essential of heaven and of the church.

In common with most words in Scripture, we find an opposite meaning due to our own perversion, causing the

highest things to become the lowest. Love to the Lord and to the neighbor, the enduring mountains and hills, become the love of self and of the world, the infernal mountains which with the Lord's help only can be removed. We shall find it less confusing for our purposes to confine our attention to these meanings rather than to attempt the different shades of meaning of mountains in the celestial and spiritual senses.

Let us now consider some of the multitude of passages from the Scriptures in which the uses of mountains in their literal sense are plainly connected with their correspondential meaning.

Great is the Lord, and greatly to be praised in the city of our God, in the mountain of his holiness.

Beautiful for situation, the joy of the whole earth, is Mount Zion, on the sides of the north, the city of the great King. (Psalm xlviii, 1, 2.)

In Deuteronomy xxxiv, 1-4, the Lord from Mount Nebo shows Moses all the promised land. It is only from an elevation that one can obtain an extensive view, and see the different objects in their true relations to one another. How easy it is in this narrative to understand that a true view of the heavenly kingdom can be obtained only after ascending to the mountain state of charity and love.

Walk about Zion, and go round about her: tell the towers thereof.

Mark ye well her bulwarks, consider her palaces; that ye may tell it to the generation following. (Psalm xlviii, 12, 13.)

They that trust in the Lord shall be as Mount Zion which cannot be removed, but abideth forever.

As the mountains are round about Jerusalem, so the Lord is round about his people, from henceforth even forever. (Psalm cxxv, 1, 2.)

In Mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance. (Joel ii, 32.)

What a contrast as we see the opposite meaning in the following:

Truly in vain is salvation hoped for from the hills, and from the

multitude of mountains: truly in the Lord our God is the salvation of Israel. (Jeremiah iii, 23.)

Every valley shall be filled, and every mountain and hill shall be brought low. (Luke iii, 5.)

Have the faith of God [Swedenborg's translation —faith which makes one with charity—saving faith] for verily I say unto you, that whosoever shall say unto this mountain, Be thou removed, and be thou cast into the sea; and shall not doubt in his heart, but shall believe that those things which he saith shall come to pass; he shall have whatsoever he saith. (Mark xi, 22, 23.)

To my mind this is one of the most encouraging verses in the Bible, signifying that with the Lord's help the mountain of self-love can be removed.

We learn in I Kings and in I and II Chronicles that timber and stone for David's house and for Solomon's house and for Solomon's temple came from the Lebanon range. Solomon's house is called "the house of the forest of Lebanon" in I Kings vvi, 2. The beautiful fragrant cedar resisting decay and proof against boring insects was a product of the mountains, as was also the firm, hard limestone.

They brought [for the temple] great stones, costly stones, and hewed stones to lay the foundation of the house. (I Kings v, 17.)

Contrast this with a description of the destruction of Babylon (self-love):

Behold I am against thee, O destroying mountain, saith the Lord, which destroyest all the earth: and I will stretch out mine hand upon thee, and roll thee down from the rocks, and I will make thee a burnt mountain.

And they shall not take of thee a stone for a corner, nor a stone for foundations; but thou shalt be desolate forever, saith the Lord. (Jeremiah li, 25, 26.)

The story of Elijah and the prophets of Baal, told in the 18th chapter of I Kings, is one of many exhibitions of power from the mountains.

The strength of the hills is his also. (Psalm xcv, 4.)

We are all familiar with the miracle of feeding upon the mountain by the sea of Galilee the five thousand with five barley loaves and two small fishes (John 6).

And in this mountain shall the Lord of hosts make unto all people a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined. (Isaiah xxv, 6.)

From the wonderful allegory in the 34th chapter of Ezekiel, let us cull a few verses:

Woe to the shepherds of Israel that do feed themselves! Should not the shepherds feed the flocks? (2d verse.)

And I will bring them out from the people . . . and feed them upon the mountains of Israel by the rivers. (13th verse.)

And I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David. (23rd verse.)

In fulfilment of this the Good Shepherd comes:

And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice: and there shall be one fold, and one shepherd. (John x, 16.)

The rivers, rain, and dew, are the abundant truths that come to those who are in the good things of love and charity. (See Arcana Cœlestia, n. 795.)

He sendeth the springs into the valleys, which run among the hills.

They give drink to every beast of the field: the wild asses quench their thirst. (Psalm civ, 10, 11.)

There shall be upon every high mountain, and upon every high hill, rivers and streams of waters in the day of the great slaughter, when the towers fall. (Isaiah xxx, 25.)

He watereth the hills from his chambers: the earth is satisfied with the fruit of thy works. (Psalm civ, 13.)

In Moses's blessing of the children of Israel we find these verses of surpassing beauty:

And of Joseph he said, Blessed of the Lord be his land, for the precious things of heaven, for the dew, and for the deep that coucheth beneath. . . .

For the chief things of the ancient mountains and for the precious things of the lasting hills. (Deut. xxxiii, 13, 15.)

I will be as the dew unto Israel. (Hosea xiv, 5.)

Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity. . . .

As the dew of Hermon and as the dew that descended upon the mountains of Zion: for there the Lord commanded the blessing, even life forevermore. (Psalm cxxxiii, 1, 3.)

We should naturally expect some of the deepest and most touching events to be connected with the Mount of Olives with its threefold signification; mountain (or love) further emphasized by olives (olives and olive oil having a similar meaning), and reinforced by its position in reference to Jerusalem—on the East.

It is well known that all our early church buildings had the repository and chancel at the east end, as a symbol that the Church must always look to the Lord.

Then shall the Lord go forth and fight against those nations, as when he fought in the day of battle.

And his feet shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the East. (Zech. xiv, 3, 4.)

This prophecy of the Lord's coming we find fulfilled in the New Testament as in Luke xxi, 37.

And every day he was teaching in the temple; and every night he went out, and lodged in the mount that is called the Mount of Olives.

It was on this mountain that the Lord Himself foretold his Second Coming, as recorded in the 24th chapter of Matthew, in answer to the disciples' question: "Tell us when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming?"

This Second Coming was visualized by John from another mountain in the isle of Patmos:

And he carried me away in the spirit to a great and high mountain, and showed me that great city, the holy Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God; having the glory of God . . . (Revelation xxi, 10, 11.)

It was from the Mount of Olives that the agonizing prayer in preparation for his crucifixion arose, and brought the angel strengthening him (Luke xxii, 41-43). And upon the same mountain His disciples stood and watched His ascent to heaven (Acts i, 12).

A few years ago a very dear friend, a Congregational minister, was nearing his end. I asked him what in his opinion was the greatest attainment in life. Without a moment's hesitation came the answer, "Peace." I did not at that time realize the depth of meaning in that little word.

By peace are signified all the things in the complex which are from the Lord. . . . Charity, spiritual security, and internal rest are peace. (Apocalypse Revealed, n. 306.)

Peace signifies the union of the Divine itself and the Divine Human in the Lord, and the conjunction of the Lord with heaven and with the church. . . . Therefore the sabbath was instituted for a remembrance of those things, and named from rest or peace. (Heaven and Hell, n. 287.)

In the beautiful imagery of the Old Testament:

The mountains shall bring peace to the people. (Psalm lxxii, 3.)

O, that thou hadst hearkened to my commandments, then had thy peace been as a river, and thy righteousness as the waves of the sea. (Isaiah xlviii, 18.)

In the New Testament, we find that the mountains (Divine love) and the rivers (streams of truth flowing from the Divine love) are both contained in the Lord Jesus Christ.

Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth give I unto you.

Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid. (John xiv, 27.)

From Mount Sinai, rocky and severe, the Ten Commandments were given in awful solemnity, while the people were commanded not even to touch the mountain. Up the gentle verdure-clad slopes of the Horns of Hattin the disciples followed the Lord to hear directly from His mouth the beautiful positive side of the laws of life in the form of the Ten Blessings. And again at His friendly call, they ascend the mountain upon which he ordained the twelve.

That they should be with him and that He might send them forth to preach;

And to have power to heal sicknesses and to cast out devils. (Mark iii, 14-15.)

Peter, James and John were privileged to be with him upon the mount of transfiguration, and in a most impressive vision to learn the lesson of His divinity, Moses and Elias fading away, Jesus standing alone in His glory. (Matthew xvii, 1-8.)

And once more, upon another mountain, in the closing verses of the same Gospel, we have the Lord's own statement of the essential unity of the Divine, and of the eternity of His presence.

All power is given unto me in heaven and on earth. . . . Lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world. (Matthew xxviii, 18, 20.)

Let us close with a few uplifting passages,—

I will lift up mine eyes to the mountains, whence cometh my help. My help is from the Lord, who made the heavens and the earth. Psalm cxxi, 1, 2.)

And it shall come to pass in the last days that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it.

And many people shall go and say, Come ye and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and He will teach us of His ways, and we will walk in His paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. (Isaiah ii, 2, 3.)

O Zion, that bringest good tidings, get thee up into the high mountain; O Jerusalem, that bringest good tidings, lift up thy voice with strength, lift it up, be not afraid, say unto the cities of Judah, Behold your God. (Isaiah xl, 9.)

How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace, that bringeth good tidings of good, that publisheth salvation, that saith to Zion, thy God reigneth. (Isaiah lii, 7.)

How the Lord Himself loved the mountains! Can we doubt that it was but the outward expression of that deep inward yearning for a complete union with the Divine by which he was to make possible our salvation.

Asa E. Goddard.

EMERSON AND THE SWEDENBORGIANS[1]

By Clarence Hotson, Ph.D.

IN my article "Sampson Reed, A Teacher of Emerson,"[2] I showed how Ralph Waldo Emerson's interest in the teachings of Emanuel Swedenborg (1688-1772) first arose through his reading, in 1826, Sampson Reed's "Growth of the Mind." This interest culminated in "Swedenborg; or, the Mystic," which Emerson gave as a lecture at Boston, and at Manchester, England, and later published, in revised form, in "Representative Men." It also expressed itself through his interest in Swedenborg's organized disciples, the Church of the New Jerusalem, and especially in its Boston Society, which organized first in 1818.

Even before he read Sampson Reed's "Growth of the Mind," Emerson had been vaguely aware of this new religious body. In his Journal, December 10, 1824, speaking of the "Evils of Imagination," he remarked on:

> The avidity with which tales of wonder are caught and propagated. Hence Gibbon's remark that men of imagination are dogmatic . . . Quietists, Essenes, Quakers, Swedenborgians. (J. II, 25.)

January 18, 1830, however, he wrote that the greatness of human desires is surely one element of the greatness of man. The love of the marvellous, and all the fantastic theories of mystics, are in that view good. (J. II, 285.)

---

[1] Reprinted from *Studies in Philology*, Vol. XXVII, No. 3, July, 1930, with the permission of both the author and the editor, whose kindness is graciously acknowledged. The courtesy of Houghton Mifflin Company in permitting the use of certain copyrighted matter in this article is also acknowledged.

[2] *New England Quarterly*, April, 1929.

In a letter to his aunt, Mary Moody Emerson, in praise of Sampson Reed's book, Emerson wrote, in October, 1826:

> As to his sect, you know they exult in the independent testimony of poor Wordsworth, to the same truths which they get from Swedenborg. (J. II, 124.)

While he was the minister of the Second Church in Boston (by this time Unitarian), he wrote in his Journal for October 9, 1829, under the heading "New Jerusalem Church":

> I am glad to see that interpretations of Scripture like those of the New Jerusalem Church can be accepted in our community. The most spiritual and sublime sense is put upon various historical passages of the New Testament. The interpretation of the passages is doubtless wholly false. The Apostle John in Patmos and our Saviour in his talking, meant no such things as the commentator says he meant. But the sentiment which the commentator puts into their mouths is nevertheless true and eternal. The wider that sentiment can be spread and the more effect it can have on men's lives, the better. And if the fool-part of man must have the lie, if truth is a pill that can't go down till 'tis sugared with superstition, why then I will forgive the last in the belief that the truth will enter into the soul natively and so assimilantly that it will become part of the soul and so remain, when the falsehood grows dry and lifeless and peels off. (J. II, 267-68.)

This comment was prompted by his reading of the first article in the *New Jerusalem Magazine* for September, 1829. In that article, under the heading "Illustrations of Scripture,"[3] Reverend Thomas Worcester, pastor of the New Jerusalem Church of Boston, gave a Swedenborgian interpretation of the Apocalypse of John, X, 1-4, and of some Gospel passages.

Emerson here made a clear and useful distinction between questions of fact and questions of spiritual truth. He recognized the spiritual truth which resulted from the Swedenborgian interpretation of certain passages of Scripture,

[3] The general title of a series of Swedenborgian interpretations of the Revelation of John, given first as sermons by Reverend Thomas Worcester. (See Sampson Reed, *A Biographical Sketch of Thomas Worcester, D. D.*, Boston, 1880, 91-2, 100.)

while calling the method of interpretation false. A disciple of Swedenborg might reply that just as a tree is known by its fruits, so is the method of interpretation justified by its results.[4]

Discussing "Enthusiasts" (by which term he meant those who train their moral powers alone, to the neglect of their intellectual powers) Emerson wrote, November 3, 1830:

> The Swedenborgian thinks himself wholly different and infinitely more favoured than the Quaker or the Methodist. Yet is nothing more like than the mode in which they severally describe this common experience. Their likeness is greater than their difference. (J. II, 318.)

Less favorable is the tone of a passage in "The Over-Soul" (*Essays, First Series*, 1841), which Emerson published:

> Everywhere the history of religion betrays a tendency to enthusiasm.[5] The rapture of the Moravian and Quietist: the opening of the eternal sense of the Word, in the language of the New Jerusalem Church; the *revival* of the Calvinistic churches: the *experiences* of the Methodists, are varying forms of that shudder of awe and delight with which the individual soul always mingles with the universal soul. (*Centenary Ed.*, II, 282.)

This statement, incidentally shows that Emerson's interest was at this time exclusively in the mystical side of religion, not at all in the doctrinal side. But in this statement

---

[4] Intelligent persons, it seems to me, do not accept religion on authority, but exercise their own judgment of spiritual values. Swedenborg's ideas, therefore, whether he read them out of or into the Scriptures (for my purpose it is unnecessary to discuss whether he did the one thing or the other) constitute, when understood, a body of doctrine which the intelligent student can and should judge entirely on its own merits, regardless of the nature of its connection with the Scriptures. For no intelligent person, I think, will permit any question of that sort to prejudice his mind either for or against Swedenborg's essential teachings.

[5] In his Journal, however, between February 2 and 11, 1835, he had quoted with approval:

"Nothing great was ever achieved without enthusiasm." (J. III, 447.)

he gave the New Jerusalem Church people credit for more mysticism, by a good deal, than they ever possessed. Swedenborg may or may not have been a mystic, in the true technical sense of the word. But his organized disciples certainly have had little of any such tendency. They are about as mystical as the Episcopalians.

Emerson made a slight mistake in the phrase he ascribed to the Swedenborgians. It should be "the opening of the *in*ternal [not *e*ternal] sense of the Word." By this phrase the disciples of Swedenborg have usually understood the revelation (in the sense of authoritative information) of a series of occult or esoteric meanings in Scripture, a revelation once for all made "by the Lord through Swedenborg."

What Swedenborg himself, however, meant by the opening of the internal sense of the Word he explained in *"Apocalypsis Revelata":*

> And I saw Heaven opened, and behold, a white Horse, signifies the spiritual Sense of the Word revealed by the Lord, and by it the interior understanding of the Word disclosed, which is the Coming of the Lord. (n. 820.)[6]

In the same passage he wrote:

> *Sensus spiritualis est intellectus Verbi interior* (the spiritual sense is the interior understanding of the Word.)

Then he explained that the Lord is the Word, that is, the very Divine Truth, or Divine Truth itself (*Ipsum Divinum Verum*). Since "Word" in Swedenborg's interpretation means Divine Truth, it follows that the spiritual or internal sense of the Word is the spiritual or interior understanding of Divine Truth. It is not just a series of words in place of the words of Scripture, but a faculty of the enlightened spiritual mind. For Swedenborg also said:

> *Quod Sensus spiritualis Verbi non alicui posthac detur, nisi qui in genuinis veris a Domino est.* (The spiritual Sense of the Word

[6] *Et vidi Coelum apertum, et ecce Equus albus, significat Sensum spiritualem Verbi a Domino revelatum, et per id intellectum Verbi interiorem detectem, quod est Adventum Domini.* See also *Arcana Cœlestia,* 2761-2, 2813, 3229, 4868, 5247, 5614.

will not be given hereafter to anyone, except to one who is in genuine truths from the Lord.[7] *Vera Christiana Religio*. 208.)

In a Journal note, October 13, 1832, Emerson questioned the ability of the Boston New Church members to explain their own doctrines:

> We see a new sect devoted to certain ideas, and we go to individuals of it to have them explained. (*Editor's footnote:* Probably referring to the Swedenborgians.) Vain expectation! They are possessed with the ideas, but do not possess them.[8] (J. II, 520.)

He should, it seems to me, have gone directly to Swedenborg's own writings.

Late in 1832, Emerson resigned his pastorate at the Second Church, Boston, and shortly thereafter sailed for Europe.

On his return voyage from this first trip to Europe, September 8, 1833, he mentioned Swedenborg as one of seven "eminent men of each church," who all, because of the Moral Truth they have in common, "think and say the same thing." (J. III, 200.)

In a letter to Reverend James Freeman Clarke, Louisville, Kentucky, from Plymouth, Massachusetts, Emerson wrote, March 12, 1834, that Carlyle was cheered by learning that his papers were read by young Americans unknown to him, and that one piece in particular had attracted warm commendation from "the New Jerusalem people here."[9]

In a letter to Carlyle, November 20, 1834, Emerson wrote:

> I am glad you like Sampson Reed, and that he has inspired some curiosity respecting his Church. Swedenborgianism, if you should be fortunate in your first meetings, has many points of attraction for you: for instance, this article, "The poetry of the Old Church

[7] See also *Arcana Celestia*, 2760, 8106, 9086, 10402; *Apocalypsis Explicata*, 376; *De Verbo*, 21.

[8] In "Powers and Laws of Thought" (1870) Emerson repeated this statement. (Centenary, XII, 47.)

[9] Oliver Wendell Holmes, "Ralph Waldo Emerson," *American Men of Letters Series*, Boston, 1885, 78.

is the reality of the New," which is to be literally understood, for they esteem, in common with all the Trismegisti, the Natural World as strictly the symbol or exponent of the Spiritual, and part for part; the animals to be the incarnations of certain affections, and scarce a popular expression esteemed figurative, but they affirm to be the simplest statement of fact. Then is their whole theory of social relations—both in and out of the body—most philosophical, and, though at variance with the popular theology, self-evident. It is only when they come to their descriptive theism, if I may say so, and then to their drollest heaven, and to some autocratic not moral decrees of God, that the mythus loses me. In general, too, they receive the fable instead of the moral of their Aesop. *They are to me, however, deeply interesting, as a sect which I think must contribute more than all other sects to the new faith which must arise out of all.*[10]

Most interesting and significant is the sentence:

In general, too, they receive the fable instead of the moral of their Aesop.

If this is so, it follows logically, that the "descriptive theism," the "drollest heaven," and the "autocratic not moral decrees of God," if any, belong to the fable, and not to the moral, of Swedenborg. Had Emerson drawn that inference, and applied it consistently, he might have spared his hearers and readers much derogatory comment on Swedenborg, in his later "Swedenborg."

This "fable and moral" sentence shows, I believe, that he read an article by Caleb Reed in the *New Jerusalem Magazine* for April, 1834, entitled "Remarks on Swedenborgianism, by the Editors of the Vermont Chronicle." In this article Caleb Reed attempted, from the denomination's point of view, to answer an editorial article on Swedenborgianism in the *Vermont Chronicle* for March 14, 1834, and for this purpose reprinted the article. Speaking of certain truths which are exhibited more clearly in the "New Church" than elsewhere, the *Vermont Chronicle* said:

[10] *The Correspondence of Carlyle and Emerson, 1834-1872,* edited by Charles Eliot Norton, Boston, 1883, I, 32-3.

[The significance of the last sentence in this quotation has led us to italicize it.—Editors of the *New-Church Review.*]

A piously disposed person . . . may very naturally be led to regard the "New Church" as greatly superior to all others, and may attach himself to it, with a strong persuasion that he shall, ere long, find valuable meaning in all its seeming absurdities. . . .

It is, at least difficult for us, while in the body, to contemplate universal truths, steadily and for a considerable time, without embodying them in some sensible form. . . . In condescension to human weakness, the Bible presents spiritual truths to us in the same way. . . .

Hence, when an universal truth is presented to the mind . . . there is a spontaneous effort of the mind . . . to individualize that truth. . . .

The "New Church" carries this very far. Every thing concerning the spiritual world is given to us in this way. All truths concerning that world are presented to us under those sensible forms with which the mind of Swedenborg invested them. And these sensible forms are described to us, not as symbols of spiritual truths, but as matters of fact, concerning the spiritual world. As such they seem to have been regarded by Swedenborg himself. (*New Jerusalem Magazine,* VII, 303-4.)

This, it seems to me, is unusually intelligent criticism. Indeed, these "sensible forms" may *seem* to have been regarded as matters of *sensual* fact or experience by Swedenborg himself. But as a matter of fact, did he so regard them? It seems to me, after careful study, that he regarded them, not as matters of sense experience, but as matters of spiritual fact, experience, or reality. Let other students look, as I did, for his own definitions of the terms he used, and having found them, supply these definitions where the terms recur, disregarding any or all other meanings which any word so defined might conceivably convey, if the user of the word were someone other than Swedenborg.

When he has done this, the student will find that Swedenborg teaches spiritual truths by means of symbols taken from objects of sensation as well as from other objects of thought, symbols the meaning of which to his own mind Swedenborg clearly indicated in many passages. The student understands his meaning only by attaching to the symbol Swedenborg used the meaning it conveyed to the

master's own mind, the spiritual idea which he attached to it.

The modern student interested primarily in finding out for himself what Swedenborg meant is under no such handicap as Emerson or his contemporaries. He has now the great "Swedenborg Concordance," by the proper use of which it is possible to find, among other things, Swedenborg's associations of ideas with nearly every important term he employed. The student who works in the right way with the original Latin and the "Concordance" need have no difficulty in arriving at a clear idea of Swedenborg's meaning in any particular short passage.

That Emerson at this time was unwilling to study Swedenborg's writings is plain from a Journal note dated September 14, 1834:

> If Dr. Linberg[11] would have me study Swedenborg because I have respect for his doctrines, I shall hold it sufficient answer that the *aura* of those books is not agreeable to my intellectual state. It is not for nothing that one word makes such impression, and the other none; it is not without preëstablished harmony, this sculpture in the memory.[12] . . . I will not so far do violence to myself as to read them against my inclination. (J. II, 338.)

This sentiment would be all very well, but for the fact that a man who later lectured, as Emerson did, on Swedenborg, should have been willing to take more trouble in studying his subject than the Concord sage seems ever to have taken.

December 28, 1834, Emerson remarked that the Sweden-

---

[11] Dr. Henning Gottfried Linberg, a Dane, translator of Victor Cousin's "Introduction to the History of Philosophy," became a judge of the High Court of St. Croix, in the Danish West Indies, where he was one of the first Swedenborgians to reside. (*New Jerusalem Magazine,* III, 94; V, 288; XIV, 189, 190; *Convention Record,* 1830: 17.)

[12] Compare "Self-Reliance" (*Essays, First Series,* 1841):

> Not for nothing one face, one character, one fact, makes much impression on him, and another none. This sculpture in the memory is not without preëstablished harmony. (*Centenary,* II, 46.)

borgians ought to be a happy exception to the prevailing lifelessness of preaching in traditional language, if their pulpit resembled their book (obviously, *Growth of the Mind*). (J. III, 421.) The next day, however, December 29, he wrote that the distinction between a spiritual and a traditional religion should be made apparent to church people, and wrote:

> There are parts of faith so great, so self-evident, that when the mind rests in them the pretensions of the most illuminated, most pretending sect pass for nothing. When I rest in perfect humility, when I burn with pure love, what can Calvin or Swedenborg say to me?[13]

Emerson apparently confused Swedenborg with the denomination of his disciples. But he was interested in finding out for himself the quality of their preaching, for he wrote in his Journal, in Concord, January 6, 1835:

> Sunday I went for the first time to the Swedenborg Chapel. The sermon was in its style severely simple, and in method and manner had much the style of a problem in geometry, wholly uncoloured and unimpassioned. Yet was it, as I told Sampson Reed, one that, with the exception of a single passage, might have been preached without exciting surprise in any church. (J. III, 430.)

The "Swedenborg Chapel" was then in Phillips Place, Boston, near what is now the Court House in Pemberton Square, where Houghton and Dutton's store now stands.[14] The preacher Emerson described was beyond question Thomas Worcester.[15] Of his sermon style his biographer, Sampson Reed, said:

> He was never hortatory, neither was he argumentative. His

---

[13] J. III, 422-23. Emerson repeated this last sentence in "The Over-Soul," *Centenary*, II, 295.

[14] *75th Anniversary, Boston Society*, 11-12; Ednah C. Silver, *Sketches of the New Church in America*, Boston, c. 1920, illustration opposite p. 78.

[15] Sampson Reed's address, *New Jerusalem Magazine*, XI, 123, last sentence on the page.

sermons were eminently of the "yea, yea, nay, nay," character. (Reed, *Worcester,* 91.)

Emerson went on to call the preacher a "hard truist," but ended by saying that he, Emerson, was not deceived in thinking that the Swedenborg chapel was a living one. (J. III, 430, 432.)

That it needed considerable moral courage at this time openly to join the Swedenborgian denomination, is apparent from a note Emerson made between August 3 and 5, 1835:

> Nothing is so cheap as jests of the sort that fill Byron's "Heaven and Earth." They might be manufactured by the thousand. All the dinner wit that assails Swedenborg and his church is cut off the same piece. (J. III, 529.)

Swedenborg, of course, had nothing to do with the actual organization of "his church," and never made any attempt to found a sect. It first organized fifteen years after his death.

June 16, 1836, Emerson wrote that he was persuaded that Swedenborg would presently become popular:

> He needs only to be regarded as a poet, instead of a sectarian and low religious dogmatist, to be read and admired for his verities. (J. IV, 70.)

Why, then, did Emerson, in "Swedenborg; or, the Mystic," treat the seer as a sectarian and low religious dogmatist?

In his Journal for September 26, 1836, Emerson remarked that Sectarianism is the ignorance of God:

> How curious we are respecting the attainments of another mind in the knowledge of Deity, is shown by our desire to know of Calvinism and Swedenborgianism. The man of another church is no nearer to God than you are, yet you feel so far from God as to be curious concerning what each bigot can say. . . . When I am sane and devout, I see well what sort of revelation a good man hath; I see my curiosity concerning revivals and devotees to be vain. I oversee them. (J. IV, 101-2.)

Too bad that Emerson was so incurious as to Swedenborg's own writings, and curious up to this time only about

the New Church body's interpretation or misinterpretation of them.

Several Journal entries indicate that Emerson had Swedenborgian friends in addition to Sampson Reed. At New Bedford, March 21, 1834, he wrote:

> My Swedenborgian friend Dr. Stebbins[16] tells me that he esteems himself "measureably excused for not preaching whilst I remain here, as I am giving as much New Jerusalem doctrine as the people will bear." (J. III, 266.)

In the Journal, October 25, 1836, is the record of correspondence with Reverend Warren Burton (1800-61), Emerson's fellow-student and associate at Harvard, an earnest Swedenborgian and worker in the cause of education. (J. IV, 124.) Burton preached, lectured, and wrote books and magazine articles on educational and social reform. From 1841 to 1844 he was minister-at-large among the poor in Boston. He was hampered by poverty and ill-health. A convert from Unitarianism, he does not seem to have been associated with the regular New Church organization.

Some time between September, 1834, and June, 1838, it appears, Emerson recommended to Benjamin Fisk Barrett, who was then a student at the Divinity School at Cambridge, that he borrow from the library of Harvard College one of Swedenborg's theological works. At the time the young student, who had a warm affection and high esteem for Emerson, did not manage to get far in the book he borrowed, "True Christian Religion," and even wondered how so sensible a man as he considered Mr. Emerson to be could have recommended to him such a work.[17] Subsequent study

[16] Dr. Artemas Stebbins (died November 26, 1871, at Swansea, aged 84) was a physician, who, while practising his profession, introduced Swedenborg's doctrine, as he understood it, into Bridgewater, Massachusetts, in the fall of 1821. He was a genial and attractive preacher. (*New Jerusalem Magazine*, XLIV, 471-6.)

[17] *Benjamin Fisk Barrett, An Autobiography*, Philadelphia, 1890, 34, 54-56. Mr. Barrett says the book was "Apocalypse Revealed," but his statement that he turned to one of the "Memorable Rela-

of Swedenborg's theological works, however, gave Mr. Barrett full conviction of their truth and value, and converted him from Unitarian to Swedenborgian views, in disseminating which he became eventually most active and influential. Mr. Barrett was only one of many men who owed their first introduction to Swedenborg, to Emerson's favorable though cautious comments.

Twice in his Journal Emerson referred to John Flaxman (1755-1826), the noted English sculptor, and friend of William Blake. The first entry, January 9, 1832, notes that Flaxman wrote the article "Beauty" and "Sculpture" in Ree's Encyclopaedia. (J. II, 447.) This note occurs at just the time when Emerson would have seen the article entitled "Memoir of Flaxman the Sculptor" which appeared in the *New Jerusalem Magazine* for December, 1831. That he knew of Flaxman's Swedenborgianism, which the "Memoir" article indicated in its second sentence, is evident from a later Journal entry, July 9, 1836:

> I have looked over the designs for Dante by Flaxman. Flaxman was a disciple of Swedenborg, and the result is accordingly a three-fold cord in which each may claim his strand. (J. IV, 77.)

Wondering why, with all the American pretension, there was so little creative achievement, Emerson wrote in his Journal, June 18, 1838:

> But it is fair to ask these Reformers, Democrats, New Churches and Transcendentalists, Where is your Poetry, your Science, your Art? Why slumbers the Creative Hand?[18] (J. IV, 484.)

November 28, 1836, Emerson wrote in his Journal:

> In what I call the *cyclus* of orphic words, which I find in Bacon,

---

tions" in the book, about Calvin, proves that the book must have been "True Christian Religion," for the "Relation" to which he refers occurs only in T. C. R. 798.

[18] In her *Sketches of the New Church in America,* Boston, 1920, Miss Ednah C. Silver (1838-1928) has enumerated, 265-73, a respectable list of New Church members who have been more or less distinguished in creative fields.

in Cudworth, in Plutarch, in Plato, in that which the New Church would indicate when it speaks of the truths possessed by the primeval church broken up into fragments and floating hither and thither in the corrupt church, I perceive myself addressed thoroughly. They do touch the intellect and cause a gush of emotion which we call the moral sublime; they pervade also the moral nature. (J. IV, 154).

"Church" in Swedenborg's use of the term means not any ecclesiastic or sectarian organization, but the state of conjunction of good and truth in the soul.[19]

In his Journal, October 20, 1837, to illustrate his saying that the philosopher disregards all the conventional aspects of his hero, and studies only the new and voluntary part of each man, Emerson remarked:

> In our times, a good example was set by the members of the New Jerusalem Church in London. Somebody, at great pains, violated the tomb of Swedenborg and brought away the skull from the body. It was then offered at a great price to his disciples. Not one of them cared to look at it. (J. IV, 333.)

This note shows that Emerson read the first edition of Nathaniel Hobart's *Life of Emanuel Swedenborg*, Boston, 1831, which, in its Appendix IX, 160-63, quotes from the "Intellectual Repository" (the organ of the British Swedenborgians) for July, 1823. In 1817, said the account, Lieutenant or Captain Ludvig Granholm, of the Swedish navy, being present at a burial in the Swedish Church in London, came to the coffin of Swedenborg:

> Observing the coffin lid to be loose, it occurred to his thoughts, that if he could possess himself of the skull, he might perhaps dispose of it profitably to some of the admirers of his principles, whom he had heard to be numerous in this country, but of whom and their sentiments he had so little knowledge, as not to be aware that they are the last people on earth to form an attachment to relics, or to fall into any of the mummery of saintcraft. (Hobart, *Swedenborg*, 162.)

He accordingly purloined the skull, and afterwards

[19] See *Apocalypsis Revelata*, 5, 72, 97, 182, 285, 349, 357, 359, 486, 492, 493, 797, 799, 832, 910.

"applied to Mr. Hawkins, and to other members of the New Church, in hopes of finding a purchaser: but was disappointed." The skull was returned to the coffin after Granholm's death, which happened in London not long afterward. None of Swedenborg's disciples, says the extract in conclusion, cared anything about the matter.

Quite recently the Swedish navy played a far different part in relation to Swedenborg's remains. Through the agitation set on foot by the late Alfred E. Stroh, the Swedish Parliament took action, and a warship, the "Fylgia," was sent in April, 1908, to Dartmouth, England, where it took on board Swedenborg's remains. On the day of embarkation, April 8, 1908, the following ode, entitled *Vates Redux*, was read at the carrying of the remains in state on board the Swedish frigate:

> En tua nos patrio (patria revocante) gementes,
> Maxime Suecorum, reddimus ossa solo.
> Num vero tantos animi celebrare labores,
> Num tantum ingenium carmina nostra valent?
> Arcana an petimus Cœlestia? an ipsa vagamur
> Per loca Naturæ? Te duce lucet iter.
> At tuba conclamat, panduntur vela, carina
> Prosilit, et resonat terra relicta vale:—
> "Nunc licet ad sedem redeas, vir sancte, paternam;
> Laus tua cum nobis haud peritura manet."[20]

Swedenborg's remains were received with much ceremony in the Cathedral at Upsala, and placed in a beautiful sarcophagus. A memorial church in Stockholm has since been built. Thus Sweden has done tardy justice to the memory of her greatest son.

In his Journal, April 30, 1838, on the superiority of spontaneity to tradition, Emerson said:

> This topic were no bad one for the Dartmouth College boys whom I am to address in July. Let them know how prompt the limiting instinct is in our constitution, so that the moment the mind by one bold leap (an impulse from the Universal) has set itself free from the old church, and of a thousand years of dogma, and seen the

[20] *New-Church Messenger*, XCIV, 19, p. 293, cf. p. 358.

light of moral nature, say *with Swedenborg*,—on the instant the defining lockjaw shuts down his fetters and cramps all round us, and we must needs think in the genius and speak in the phraseology of Swedenborg, and the last slavery is even worse than the first. (J. IV, 433-34.)

The "defining lockjaw" which afflicts alike most disciples and all hostile critics of Swedenborg is, paradoxically, their invariable failure to note how Swedenborg is *defining* his terms. Because of this failure, those who speak in the phraseology of Swedenborg seldom really think in his genius.

June 21, 1838, Emerson made in his Journal a comment he later published in his *Essays, First Series* (1841):

A church is a classification. Say rather a new mind is; Swedenborg is a new classification, as Phrenology, as Benthamism, as Abolitionism, as Calvinism is; and the neophytes take the same delight in subordinating everything to their new terminology that a girl does who has just learned Botany. (J. IV, 487-88.)

In this published essay, "Self-Reliance," he gave the disciples of Swedenborg special notice:

Every new mind is a new classification. If it prove a mind of uncommon activity and power . . . it imposes its classification on other men, and lo! a new system. In proportion to the depth of the thought, and so to the number of the objects it touches and brings within reach of the pupil, is his complacency. But chiefly is this apparent in creeds and churches, which are also classifications of some powerful mind acting on the elemental thought of duty and man's relation to the Highest. Such is Calvinism, Quakerism, Swedenborgism. The pupil takes the same delight in subordinating every thing to the new terminology as a girl who has just learned botany in seeing a new earth and new seasons thereby. It will happen for a time that the pupil will find his intellectual power has grown by the study of his master's mind. (*Centenary*, II, 79-80.)

That these remarks have particular reference to Swedenborgianism alone, is evident both from the fact that Calvinism and Quakerism were rather old to be called "new classifications" and from the fact that Emerson had written in his Journal for June 25, 1838:

Perhaps we have not yet got to such a distance from Swedenborg as rightly to appreciate him, or have not read him enough. And he may be a third or a fourth great genius of the world who is to set his mark on ages and on following millions. This, at least, I incline to concede to him, the truth of the remark made by a woman of his church that her intellectual power had grown by the study of his writings. (J. IV, 496-7.)

In "Swedenborg" (1849) Emerson generalized this statement:

His disciples allege that their intellect is invigorated by the study of his books. (*Centenary,* IV, 122-23.)

He continued the passage in "Self-Reliance":

But in all unbalanced minds the classification is idolized, passes for the end and not for a speedily exhaustible means, so that the walls of the system blend to their eye in the remote horizon with the walls of the universe; the luminaries of heaven seem to them hung on the arch their master built. (*Centenary,* II, 80.)

This suggests another figure of Emerson's, which he later applied to a Swedenborgian, about "patching the ecliptic of the universe with a small bit of tin." (J. X, 198-199.) His "Self-Reliance" passage ended:

They cannot imagine how you aliens have any right to see,—how you can see; "It must be somehow that you stole the light from us." They do not yet perceive that light, unsystematic, indomitable, will break into any cabin, even into theirs. Let them chirp awhile and call it their own. If they are honest and do well, presently their neat new pinfold will be too strait and low, will crack, will lean, will rot and vanish, and the immortal light, all young and joyful, million-orbed, million-colored, will beam over the universe as on the first morning. (*Centenary,* II, 80.)

The fact that Emerson owed a considerable intellectual debt to the Swedenborgians, particularly in the person of Sampson Reed, combined with the further fact that they were still an unpopular sect suspected of all kinds of queer notions, so that Emerson did not wish to be considered as belonging to them, sufficiently explains why Emerson expressed his gratitude to them by fiercely ridiculing and satirizing them in this passage.

In the same series of "Essays" he said (*Intellect*, 1841):

Each new mind we approach seems to require an abdication of all our past and present possessions. A new doctrine seems at first a subversion of all our opinions, tastes, and manner of living. Such has Swedenborg, such has Kant, such has Coleridge, such has Hegel or his interpreter Cousin seemed to many young men in this country. Take thankfully and heartily all they can give. Exhaust them, wrestle with them, let them not go until their blessing be won, and after a short season the dismay will be overpast, the excess of influence withdrawn, and they will be no longer an alarming meteor, but one more bright star shining serenely in your heaven and blending its light with all your day. (*Centenary*, II, 343-4.)

This, to be sure, is excellent advice. As so frequently happens with good advice, the sage who gave it did not follow it. Emerson never wrestled with Swedenborg as he advised others to do, and certainly came nowhere near exhausting him. No one has ever done that.

Emerson's irritation at the Swedenborgians at this time is evident from what he wrote in his Journal, June 22, 1838:

But you must treat the men and women of one idea, the Abolitionist, the Phrenologist, the Swedenborgian, as insane persons with a continual tenderness and special reference in every remark and action to their known state, which reference presently becomes embarrassing and tedious. "I am tired of fools," said once my sharp-witted Aunt to me with wonderful emphasis. (J. IV, 491.)

It is interesting to note, however, that Emerson himself eventually became something of an Abolitionist.

May 26, 1839, Emerson wrote in his Journal:

Why need you rail, or need a biting criticism on the church and the college to demonstrate your holiness and your intellectual aims? Let others draw that inference which damns the institutions, if they will. Be thyself too great for enmity and fault-finding. (J. V, 206.)

How well he himself obeyed this precept, the reader may judge from what has preceded. Between December 1 and 8, 1839, however, he wrote in his Journal:

It is very pleasant to me to hear of any fine person that he or she is a reader of Swedenborg. It is an uncomputed force,—his

influence on this age, his genius still unmeasured. He is the fabulist, the Cebes, the better Aesop of the last ages. How bland, how warm, how renovating it works on the cold crudities of Calvinism or Unitarianism! (J. V, 350.)

October 30, 1838, he had noted that a few questions as to a man's reading (whether he reads Swedenborg, for example) "determine his whole connexion and place." (J. V, 109.)

October 17, 1840, however, he wrote that as nothing will keep, but the soul demands that all shall be new today, therefore "we reject a past man, or a past man's teaching":

> Who is Swedenborg? A man who saw God and Nature for a fluid moment.[21] His disciples vainly try to make a fixture of him, his seeing, and his teaching, and coax me to accept it for God and Nature.
>
> Dependence is the only poverty. (J. V, 477.)

With every such protest, of course, Emerson merely emphasized the fact of his own indebtedness to and dependence on Swedenborg. A wise man should not proclaim his independence of a particular benefactor, while naming the benefactor. Actually, of course, Emerson eagerly accepted and frequently repeated as his own Swedenborg's ideas of correspondence, influx, order, degrees, and ultimation, using the distinctive terminology of Swedenborg in so doing.[22] And in his attempt in "Swedenborg," by assailing the master, to escape the suspicion that he was a religious disciple of Swedenborg, he contradicted himself flagrantly.

Doubtless at the time he thought he was rejecting Swedenborg's teaching. His reason for so doing, however, stamps him, in theory at least, as an extreme mystic: one

---

[21] Similarly, in some manuscript notes for a lecture on Swedenborg, Emerson wrote:

> But who is Swedenborg? A man who saw God and nature as he could for a fluid moment. You cannot make an universal self of him. (*Centenary,* IV, 332-3.)

[22] See my articles "Emerson and the Doctrine of Correspondence," *New-Church Review,* Boston, January, April, July, and October, 1929.

who rejects all tradition, and tries to put himself into direct relation with Divine Truth, to be received in individual spiritual experience.

Between September 28 and October 8, 1841, Emerson, who had never been affiliated with any church but the Unitarian, in which he had preached from an important Boston pulpit, wrote in his Journal:

> A man in black came in while I spoke and my countenance fell. Then I said, Surely I see that the Swedenborgian finds a sweetness in his church and is enveloped by it in a love and society that haunts him by night and by day, but if the Unitarian is invited to go out and preach to Unitarians at Peoria, Illinois, I see no question so fit or inevitable as that he should ask whether they will pay the expense of his journey and maintain him well. (J. VI, 76-77.)

And October 23, 1841, it was the turn of the Swedenborgians:

> Milton describes religion in his time as leaving the tradesman when he goes into his shop to meet him again when he comes out. . . . In so pure a church as the Swedenborgian I cannot help feeling the neglect which leaves holiness out of trade. These omissions damn the church. (J. VI, 97.)

The passage from Milton to which Emerson here referred he quoted in the "Lecture on the Times" (Nature, Addresses and Lectures), which he gave in Boston, December 2, 1841. In this lecture he did not mention the Swedenborgian church by name, but said only, with reference to the organized church in general:

> Such omissions judge the church. (*Centenary*, I, 274.)

Such omission of holiness from trade as may have been chargeable to some members of the New Church organization, was not Swedenborg's fault. He made the primary essential of religion, which he called charity, to consist in acting justly, sincerely, and faithfully in every work and in every function, not because it is the best policy, but because it is right, and in accordance with divine order.[23] To the extent that any of his ecclesiastically organized disciples

[23] *Heaven and Hell*, 535, at end; *Doctrine of Charity*, entire.

failed to live up to that standard, their omissions judge, or damn, their church, but not Swedenborg or his teaching.

In "Nominalist and Realist" (*Essays, Second Series,* 1844) Emerson said that Swedenborgianism was a poor pretension, but a good criticism on the preaching of the day:

> For these abnormal insights of the adepts ought to be normal, and things of course. (*Centenary,* III, 234-35.)

The year 1845, toward the close of which Emerson first lectured on Swedenborg, was a notable one in the history of the New Jerusalem Church. June 11 the present Boston House of Worship, a fine temple on Bowdoin Street, built at a cost of $60,000, with a large seating capacity, was dedicated in the presence of the Twenty-seventh General Convention of the church.[24] September 21 Professor George Bush, an eminent Congregationalist scholar in Oriental languages, and commentator on the Scriptures, announced his acceptance of Swedenborg's teachings, and commenced in Boston and elsewhere in Massachusetts a series of lectures in favor of his new faith, which attracted much attention, and somewhat aroused and alarmed the orthodox.[25] In August, Reverend Benjamin Fisk Barrett lectured to large audiences at Bangor, Maine, in favor of the same doctrines, and Enoch Pond, professor of Theology at the Presbyterian Seminary there, thereupon delivered a series of lectures attacking Swedenborgianism, which he correctly regarded as a deadly enemy of Calvinism.[26]

The interest in Swedenborg which such events as these aroused may well have led Emerson to lecture on him at this time, in his "Representative Men" series, with good prospects of earning money for his family by so doing. Accordingly, he gave on December 25, 1845, in Boston, at the Odeon, under the auspices of the Boston Lyceum, a lecture

[24] *Convention Record,* 1845: 393, 418; *New Jerusalem Magazine,* 18: 424.

[25] *New Jerusalem Magazine,* 18: 132, 19: 75; *Intellectual Repository,* 1845: 26, 114; *Boston Recorder,* November 13, 1845.

[26] *New Jerusalem Magazine,* 19: 74, 439.

on "Swedenborg, or the Mystic," as the third of a series entitled "Representative Men." This lecture was well attended, and was reported at some length in the "Boston Journal" for December 27, 1845. It was sufficiently offensive to the New Church people to call forth a reply from Professor George Bush, who answered it at the Odeon, in Boston, January 18, 1846: a reply thereupon published in pamphlet form.[27] In the pamphlet Professor Bush made his occasional quotations from the printed report of Mr. Emerson's lecture "published in a daily paper at the time." These quotations could not have been made from the *Boston Journal* report; and after an eager search, I found that they were taken from the *Boston Daily Star*, an incomplete file of which I was able at length to find in the Massachusetts Historical Society's collection of old Boston newspapers. The same newspaper published full reports of Professor Bush's lectures at this time, including his reply to Emerson on Swedenborg.

The *New Jerusalem Magazine* for February, 1846, said:

> Professor Bush lectured in Bridgewater, East Bridgewater, North Bridgewater, and Abington, delivering two or three lectures in each place, to respectable audiences. . . . He has also delivered another lecture in the Odeon, in this city, in reply to a lecture by Mr. R. W. Emerson, delivered a few weeks before, in the same place. Mr. Emerson's lecture was devoted to the character of Swedenborg. . . . Perhaps the event will show that Professor Bush acted wisely in coming forward with a public review, and in replying to the objections, and in correcting the misrepresentations of Mr. Emerson. At any rate, he had the satisfaction of drawing together a large audience of most respectable character, who evinced their interest and gratification by a close and earnest attention to the speaker. (M. XIX, 239.)

A careful examination of the *Daily Star* report of Emerson's lecture shows that his Boston lecture was decidedly less disrespectful to Swedenborg as a religious teacher, than was the final version in "Representative Men" as Emerson published it four years later.

[27] *Prof. Bush's Reply to Ralph Waldo Emerson on Swedenborg*, New York, John Allen, 139 Nassau St., 1846.

One peculiar thing about the "Swedenborg," however, and especially in its final form, is that in his unfavorable comments Emerson attacked and condemned Swedenborg, not, as was then customary, for doctrines or tendencies in which he differed from popular Christianity, so much as for doctrines and tendencies which, according to Emerson, he had in common with popular Christianity: for "theologic bias," for reverence for and concern with the Holy Scriptures, and with the Christian creed; for doctrines concerning heaven and hell, and for making a radical distinction between good and evil, either in a moral or in a spiritual sense. This anti-Christian tendency of Emerson's lecture did not escape the notice of his contemporaries, even those who had least use for Swedenborg, and brought down on Emerson's head bitter denunciation, not from the Swedenborgians, who at the time were rather pleased than otherwise at the publicity which Emerson's lecture gave to Swedenborg (unfavorable though it was, in large part), but from "orthodox Christians." Most interesting is the furious invective with which the *New England Puritan* attacked Emerson in a series of articles between February 5 and April 16, 1846. Professor Bush's reply, on the contrary, though keen and logical, was gentlemanly, temperate, and urbane. The "Puritan" based its attacks chiefly upon Emerson's lectures on Swedenborg and on Montaigne, which it found especially offensive.

Emerson's "Swedenborg," especially as finally published, is a most curious and inconsistent performance. The final version repeatedly implies or insinuates that Swedenborg was unbalanced or insane. Yet the same version takes Swedenborg as the supreme type or example of religious prophet, and the representative of religion in general. Thus Emerson in effect identified religion in general with insanity: an attitude which seems quite inconsistent with his own religious professions.

The *Daily Star* report, January 6, 1846, on which both Professor Bush and the *New England Puritan* based their

reviews, contains a passage Emerson later omitted from "Swedenborg":

> The lecturer proceeded to consider the question, daily increasing in interest with regard to this wonderful man—has he a right to a literal reception of his visions? They may be true for him, true subjectively, but can they be received as facts? He gave Swedenborg credit for his great powers, his wonderful penetration into the moral world, and his comprehensiveness of mind, and nothing was more easy than to accept the moral of his revelations, and let the pictures and the fable go.

This shows the influence of Emerson's reading of the *Vermont Chronicle* article in the *New Jerusalem Magazine*, already mentioned. Had Emerson really taken the moral and let the fable go, he would have had no basis whatever for most of his derogatory comments on Swedenborg, and least of all for his charge of insanity—for the teaching of religious truth in parable form is not considered sufficient evidence of insanity.

Emerson gave this same lecture on Swedenborg also in Providence, Rhode Island, February 27, 1846, and, apparently, also at Lowell, Massachusetts.

Early in November, 1847, Emerson again gave his lecture on Swedenborg, considerably revised, at Manchester, England, an important center of Swedenborgian activity. All his lectures were well reported, and reprinted in London newspapers, so fully, he complained in a letter to his wife, December 16, 1847, that they were not repeatable.[28] The *Manchester Guardian* reports were the best. Once again Emerson's lecture brought sharp censure from the clergy in general, and evoked a prompt reply from the local New Church people. Reverend J. H. Smithson, basing his speech on the *Guardian* report for November 6, 1847, gave on the Sunday following Emerson's address, an able answer. This answer, together with the Emerson lecture he was answering, he published in the *Intellectual Repository* for December, 1847.

---

[28] Cabot, *Memoir of Ralph Waldo Emerson*, II, 508, 512.

In this lecture Emerson, as reported, said:

> If asked to account for that unquestionable fascination which Swedenborg exerts over a class, and a growing class, of the best and purest minds, he (the lecturer) would say it is, that Swedenborg is a man of genius, and served religion by his genius. To the withered traditional church, yielding only dry old criticism [should be, catechisms, C. H.] he let in the light of nature; and the worshipper, accustomed to receive into his understanding certain cold verbal results, is overjoyed to find himself a party to the whole of his religion; that his religion thinks for him, and is of universal application.

In his final version, designed for a wider public, Emerson substituted for the first sentence the following:

> By force of intellect, and in effect, he is the last Father in the Church, and is not likely to have a successor. No wonder that his depth of ethical wisdom should give him influence as a teacher. (*Centenary,* IV, 122.)

Depth of ethical wisdom is a peculiar result of insanity; and so also is force of intellect.

The editor of the "Centenary Edition" here quoted, in a note, from some stray leaves about Swedenborg which Emerson wrote, which he sometimes used in a lecture:

> The fascination which his mind has for those bred in the old churches, in woeful Calvinism, in sentimental Christianism, is this, that they come to a mind which believes the world has a meaning, a meaning that can be known, and which the good only can know. Swedenborg is to furnish a key to the eternal and universal engine, an explanation of the sky, of the sea, of their tenants, of our doing and suffering, of our weapons and means. What! and no longer to receive certain cold results from catechism and priest, but I am to be a party to every result, by seeing its reason and these results are no longer remote at arm's length, at life's length. (*Centenary,* IV, 329.)

Emerson continued, in the text of "Swedenborg," to praise the seer's teaching, in its attractiveness, to the disparagement of orthodox Christianity.

In the Manchester lecture, as reported, Emerson said:

> It requires for his just apprehension, almost a genius equal to his

own. Every ardent and contemplative young man, of eighteen or twenty, ought to read once these theological books of Swedenborg, and then throw them aside for ever.

In his published version, he made it read:

It requires, for his just apprehension, almost a genius equal to his own. But when his visions become the stereotyped language of multitudes of persons of all degrees of age and capacity, they are perverted. . . . An ardent and contemplative young man, at eighteen or twenty years, might read once these books of Swedenborg, these mysteries of love and conscience, and then throw them aside for ever. (*Centenary,* IV, 132.)

Here again the version he published is less favorable. Having said this much, it seems to me, he was in duty bound to go further, and to explain some of these visions in accordance with the ideas Swedenborg associated with the symbolism of the visions. But that is just what, in this lecture on Swedenborg, he did not do. Any ardent and contemplative young man who merely *read* once the books of Swedenborg, presumably in translation, and then flung them aside for ever, would misunderstand vastly more than he could understand of their meaning and message. For these books must be *studied.*

Contemporary Swedenborgian comment on Emerson's lecture is interesting. In a letter written from Manchester to Professor George Bush, January 14, 1848, Adam Haworth said that Emerson, in his lecture there, hesitated and showed some embarrassment, feeling evidently that he must have some scrutinizing minds before him, who would detect his mistakes. He repeated an offensive passage which had also been the occasion of much objection to his Boston lecture, and this brought him some disfavor in England also.

Still Mr. Emerson said so much that was laudatory in many ways of Emanuel Swedenborg that we were pleased—much pleased with his lecture on the whole.[29]

---

[29] Fernald, Woodbury M., *Memoirs and Reminiscences of the late Professor George Bush,* Boston, Otis Clapp, 1860, p. 360.

To judge from the *Manchester Guardian* report of this lecture, it still contained much less derogatory material than the final version, and less offensively worded, both from the Swedenborgian and from the ordinary Christian point of view.

Writing from London, December 3, 1847, James John Garth Wilkinson, a personal friend of Emerson's, records in the *New Jerusalem Magazine,* for January, 1848, another contemporary Swedenborgian view. Great inquiry concerning Swedenborg and his writings had been awakened in the public mind by Emerson's Manchester lecture:

> A small but conscientious section of our friends sees ground only for unmixed alarm in the singular liberties which Mr. Emerson has taken with a grave and venerable character and a subject of unmeasured importance; but the great majority feels that Swedenborg's present position cannot be lower with the public than it is, and anything which tends to stimulate the public to read his books, must be regarded as a change for the better. This is my own view. (M. XXI, 161-62.)

Wilkinson was grateful to Emerson for his "courageous act of bringing Swedenborg in any creditable guise before a public as bristling as ours is with furious prejudices." In the April issue of the same organ he wrote that ever since this lecture, the hard contraction of the public mind against Swedenborg's very name had given place to a certain dalliance with his claims and writings, which allowed all kinds of opinions to be expressed. (M. XXI, 230.)

Woodville Woodman, President of the British New Church Conference of 1847, said, addressing the American Convention, June 8, 1848, that Swedenborg's name was no longer associated with rank fanaticism; the more intelligent of other denominations admitted his extraordinary learning, genius, and research:

> The lectures of such men as Emerson . . . have no doubt been a powerful means of bringing the subject more prominently before the public; they may nevertheless be regarded, perhaps, rather as indications of the direction the current is beginning to take, than as causing it. (M. XXI, 443-44.)

In his Journal, May 25, 1849, Emerson wrote:

> Swedenborgian church an imprisonment in the letter; never a hero stirs out of it. (J. VIII, 21.)

Though he could see this much, Emerson could not point out the correct method of interpreting Swedenborg's text: that of giving to his symbols the meaning which Swedenborg gave them. He thus failed to rescue the captives imprisoned in the letter of Swedenborg's statements.

In a note on "Swedenborg" as finally published, the editor says:

> Among fragmentary notes for a lecture are these with reference to the Swedenborgian sect:
>
> "What I mean by popular religion the Swedenborgians have not conceived, but it is true that who would see truly must forsake a great as well as a little conventionalism: that of Christendom as well as that of his parish." (*Centenary,* IV, 329.)

Does this refer to the Scripture symbolism that Swedenborg used to convey to the thoughtful and to conceal from the superficial, his verities? This great conventionalism the student must accept if only to arrive by its means in Swedenborg's writings at the universal verities which it clothes. Swedenborg could use the conventional language of Christendom to express universal truths.

The quotation from the fragmentary notes continued:

> *Fascination* of Swedenborg.
>
> I cannot flatter the Swedenborgian by finding in him any resemblance to the genius and tendency of the great man whose name he bears. (*Centenary,* IV, 329.)

Heaven save any great teacher from his disciples! Emerson continued:

> Very dangerous study to any but a mind of great elasticity and power. Like Napoleon as military leader, a master of such extraordinary extent of Nature and not to be acted on by any other, that he must needs be a god to the young and enthusiastic. (*Centenary,* IV, 329-30.)

This is almost word for word repetition of a note in his Journal for April 5, 1842. (J. VI, 185-6.) The mind that studies Swedenborg ought to have elasticity and power

enough to find out what ideas he attached to the words he used, and to understand his words accordingly.

> Exceeding good behavior of the Sect a few years ago: he was pilloried in a pamphlet of garbled extracts:—the Swedenborgians circulated his book. (*Centenary,* IV, 330.)

This pamphlet was "Swedenborgianism Depicted in Its True Colors," by J. G. Pike, a Baptist minister, Boston, 1834, 68 pages, reprinted from original edition, London, 1820. "His book" is, of course, "Conjugial Love" (*De Amore Conjugiali*), certain parts of which have particularly drawn the fire of Swedenborg's opponents. Such attacks, I submit, have been made because the reader stupidly takes Swedenborg's words in their common or vulgar sense, instead of in the sense which Swedenborg, by his own explanations, gave to them.

In the last manuscript note his editor quoted, Emerson complimented the New Church people on:

> Their excellent spirit of superior tactics—nothing vulgar in their propagandism; they treated men respectfully and had the manners of people holding valuable truth. (*Centenary,* IV, 330.)

In August, 1854, Emerson wrote:

> This age is Swedenborg's. (J. VIII, 477.)

And October 11, 1854, he added:

> Swedenborg is the theosophist of the present age. 'Tis very fine for England and America, Boston and London, refined circles, to affect a scorn. Some theory must be at the bottom; and these surface creatures might be shown that they are Swedenborgians, or else skeptics. They hate—all men hate—skepticism, and when shown what kind of rotten underpinning they are strutting upon, they will kiss the robe of Swedenborg. (J. VIII, 507-8.)

Whether because of Emerson's "Swedenborg," or in spite of it, or, most likely, for reasons quite apart from Emerson, Boston's attitude to the New Church people had by this time become much more favorable than it had been at any previous time. In 1854 Thomas Worcester was elected by the Legislature an overseer of Harvard College,

and in 1856 Harvard conferred upon him the degree of Doctor of Divinity.[30] Swedenborgianism had evidently become respectable in Boston, as Emerson did after 1860.

In "Woman," a lecture he read before the Woman's Rights Convention, Boston, September 20, 1855, Emerson credited the doctrine of Emanuel Swedenborg, a "sublime genius," with having made an important step in advancing the equality of the sexes, and said of his followers:—

> Of all Christian sects this is at this moment the most vital and aggressive. (*Centenary*, XI, 416.)

Whether this more favorable attitude to the prophet whom Emerson had stoned in his "Swedenborg" reflects a genuine change of heart, or is merely a new adaptation to the change in popular sentiment, I cannot determine. It is remarkable that after attacking Swedenborg on grounds which were either absurd, frivolous, or contradictory to Emerson's own statements both in the same lecture and elsewhere, or for faults, if faults they were, which Swedenborg had, if he had them, in common with all Christian teachers, Emerson should change his tone so completely.

In "Immortality," (1875?) Emerson classed Swedenborgianism, as a neat and plausible system, with Calvinism and Romanism. (*Centenary*, VIII, 329.)

In his Journal, March 13, 1864, considering the question, "How to meet the demand for a religion," Emerson noted that Calvinism rushes to be Unitarianism, and Unitarianism rushes to be Naturalism. He said that the life of these once omnipotent traditions was really not in the legend, but in the moral sentiment and the metaphysical fact which the legends enclosed; and these survive:

> A new Socrates, or Zeno, or Swedenborg . . . may be born in this age, and, with happy heat and a bias for theism, bring asceticism and duty and magnanimity into vogue again. (J. X, 9.)

In "Life and Letters of New England" (1867) Emerson wrote:

---

[30] Reed, Sampson, *Biography of Thomas Worcester*, 18, 99, 100.

The popular religion of our fathers had received many severe shocks from the new times . . . and then I should say . . . from the slow but extraordinary influence of Swedenborg; a man of prodigious mind, though as I think tainted with a certain suspicion of insanity, and therefore generally disowned, but exerting a singular power over an important intellectual class. (*Centenary*, X, 329-30).

A mere suspicion, then, of insanity, attaching to Swedenborg in the popular mind, led Emerson in 1849 to treat Swedenborg as so certainly insane that his insanity required no demonstration or evidence. And since he had chosen Swedenborg to represent religion in general, it followed that he considered all religion a form of madness.

In "Immortality" (1875?) Emerson wrote:

The most remarkable step in the religious history of recent ages is that made by the genius of Swedenborg, who described the moral faculties and affections of man, with the hard realism of an astronomer describing the suns and planets of our system, and explained his opinion of the history and destiny of souls in a narrative form, as of one who had gone in a trance into the society of other worlds. Swedenborg described an intelligible heaven. . . . We shall pass to the future existence as we enter into an agreeable dream. All nature will accompany us there. Milton anticipated the leading thought of Swedenborg, when he wrote, in Paradise Lost,—

> "What if Earth
> Be but the shadow of Heaven, and things therein,
> Each to the other like more than on earth is thought?"

Swedenborg had a vast genius and announced many things true and admirable, though always clothed in somewhat sad and Stygian colors. These truths, passing out of his system into general circulation, are now met with every day, qualifying the views and creeds of all churches and of men of no church. And I think we are all aware of a revolution in opinion. (*Centenary*, VIII, 327-8.)

This passage, which may be considered Emerson's recantation, in whole or in part, of his seventeen pages of derogatory comment in "Swedenborg," reflects his reading of the "Essays" of Theophilus Parsons. In his essay on "Life" (*First Series*, Boston, 1855), Parsons wrote:

Another interesting result from these laws of existence is that

which explains the spirit-world. . . . Milton was more than a poet, or rather he was truly a poet, when he says,

> Though what if earth
> Be but the shadow of heaven and things therein,
> Each to the other like, more than on earth is thought?

And Wordsworth, true to the same poetic instinct, has the same idea in his Laodamia. (Sixth edition, Boston, 1868, 25-26.)

Theophilus Parsons (1797-1882) was appointed Dane Professor of Law at Harvard in 1847, and resigned his position in 1870. He had become converted to Swedenborgianism back in the days when such conversion involved a social stigma something like that which was attached to Mormonism in its early period. He was an ardent member of the New Jerusalem Church, and frequently defended its teachings in his writings.[31]

One of Emerson's later Journal entries evidently refers to this disciple of Swedenborg. April 10, 1867, he wrote:

Yesterday at the funeral of George L. Stearns. Rode to Mount Auburn in a carriage with Mr. Alcott and Mr. P., and had long conversation on Swedenborg. Mr. P., intelligent and well-versed on Swedenborg, but his intelligence stops, as usual, at the Hebrew symbolism. Philosopher up to that limit, but there accepts the village church as part of the sky. In a day not far off this English obstinacy of patching the ecliptic of the Universe with a small bit of tin will come to an end. (J. V. 198-9.)

This phrasing recurs in an address on "Religion" which Emerson gave before the Radical Club of Chestnut Street, Boston, in May, 1867:

Then you find so many men infatuated on that one topic of religion. Wise on all other topics, they lose their reason the moment they talk of religious things. . . . In a day not far off, these ridiculous attempts to patch the ecliptic of the universe with a piece of tin will come to an end.[32]

---

[31] *New Jerusalem Magazine*, new series, VI, 241; portrait, opposite page 78, Miss Silver's "Sketches of the New Church"; *ibid.*, 227, 228.

[32] Mrs. John T. Sargent, *Sketches and Reminiscences of the Radical Club*, Boston, 1880, 5.

This quotation reflects Emerson's encounters with two Swedenborgians: with Sampson Reed (J. VI, 219-20, *Centenary,* X, 199) and with Theophilus Parsons on the occasion recorded in the Journal quotation above.

A man who could not maintain a more rational and consistent attitude either toward Swedenborg or toward religion in general, than Emerson did, should have been urged by his friends to leave both topics severely alone.

The "Hebrew symbolism" of Swedenborg (by which Emerson meant the imagery and characters and history, rites, institutions, and so on, of the Old Testament) apparently caused Emerson such irritation as to deprive him of all mental clarity on the subject. He should have reflected that the important thing is not the symbol, but the meaning it conveys. One should judge Swedenborg by the meaning, the message, which he got out of or put into (for my present purpose it does not matter which anyone considers he did) the "Hebrew symbolism," and not by the mere fact that he employed that symbolism. A poet's work, and still more a philosopher's or a prophet's, should be judged by other canons than the mere question of what classical or vernacular tongue he employed.

Emerson's comments on Swedenborgianism may be said to begin and end on the relation of this system to the Scriptures. The earliest extended comment considered the New Church interpretation of Scripture to be false, but nevertheless, most spiritual and sublime. The last one, apparently, blamed the system for paying attention to the Scriptures even to the extent of reading a spiritual and sublime sense into or out of them.

The Concord sage, apparently, refused to look away from the external form to the content, the universal significance, the meaning and message of Swedenborg. His own intelligence stopped at the "Hebrew symbolism." He had such an irrational aversion to the symbolism that he failed to read the message Swedenborg used it to convey.

Emerson evinced his interest in the disciples of Sweden-

borg, especially as an organized body, by at least sixty allusions in his Journals, correspondence, and published works. Of these comments some are favorable, some neutral, and some unfavorable; and some combine praise and blame in varying proportions. Emerson's interest in the New Church people was out of all proportion to their numerical strength, and indicated some elements of keen mental sympathy.

Though he seemed able at times to discriminate between the teachings of Swedenborg and his followers' imperfect comprehension of them, he had a continual tendency to confuse the two.

CLARENCE HOTSON, PH.D.

Texas Technological College.

"RELIGION IN A CHANGING WORLD"*

THE changes that have been going on the last few decades, and are still going on, present a most perplexing situation. The rapid and threatening changes in the industrial world bring consternation even to the thoughtful. Changes in the world of moral sentiments and standards have brought confusion and dismay, if not despair. Changes in the world of science lead to uncertainty and to unsettlement of principles in our thought about the nature of the universe. All of these changes affect our everyday life, and so religion. Religion has always been subject to attacks from skeptics and atheists. These attacks have been directed mostly against the untenable positions of orthodoxy; and in the name of advanced science the so-called liberal theologians have joined with the infidels in this hostility. But now the liberal theology itself is on the defensive against a new foe, the foe of naturalism and rationalism strengthened by the assumptions and the speculations of the scientists. The consequence is, the increasing tendency of settled religious principles and convictions to disappear.

In the book before us we have an analysis and an interesting discussion of these conditions; and the discussion is especially interesting from the fact that it is by an educated and well-informed Jew. Being a Jew, the author is the better able to take an objective view of the general religious situation, and to discuss it without being so much involved in the parties concerned. It is significant that his observations and analysis are in close agreement with those of other well-informed critics, such as Walter Lippmann and H. Emil Brunner, whose results have been discussed in previous issues of this REVIEW.

**Religion in a Changing World.* By ABBA HILLEL SILVER, D.D., LITT.D. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc. 1930. 204 pp., 8vo. Cloth $2.00.

Perhaps the key-note of the book is given in the opening paragraphs, in which the case is so well stated as to make it worth while to reproduce them here.

> Much of our religious thinking in recent years has been characterized by nervousness and timidity. In the face of the widely-heralded new world of scientific mold and temper, religious thinking, especially of the liberal type, has become diffident and panicky. Never was liberal theology in such a mortal funk as it is today. For it has finally come face to face with its real foe—the Apollyon of materialism, agnosticism, and atheism.
>
> Heretofore, the religious liberal was engaged rather pleasantly in attacking orthodoxy. In his onslaught upon the crumbling citadels of orthodoxy, the liberal could command all the battering-rams of modern science. He had a fairly easy time of it—at least in the realm of ideas; and he felt secure and a bit snug in his numerous triumphs over the discomfited creeds and dogmas of orthodox religion. But the battle suddenly swept far beyond the fundamentalist-modernist sector. The main positions of religion itself, of all religion, the liberal's included, are now attacked by the ancient and bitter and powerful enemy—materialism and atheism. And this time it is the enemy who is in possession of the weapons of modern science.
>
> In this major attack upon religion, the orthodox religionist finds himself in a stronger position than the liberal. The orthodox entrenches himself in a supernaturalism against which the attacking waves of skepticism hurl themselves in vain. He is bulwarked behind revelation and tradition. The liberal, however, must fight in the open, and with weapons which, he suspects, are not as strong or as modern as those of the enemy.

The author goes on to develop the contrast between the religious and the scientific point of view, and he reduces the issue to that between the spiritual and the materialistic conception of the universe; between the view that the "universe is a Personality, an intelligent Will expressing itself in infinite variety," and the view that "it is a thing, mere blind matter in senseless agitation."

The author, however, is mistaken when he takes materialism as the worst enemy of religion. The worst enemy of religion is naturalism, not materialism. Materialism as a philosophy of the universe is easily refuted; Berkeley's refutation was complete and final in its principles and in its

main features. But naturalism goes deeper, and beyond materialism; for it includes mind as well as matter. Materialism is the orthodox philosophy of the physical world. Its failure is conspicuous in the fact that it has never succeeded in bridging the gap between matter and spirit, or body and soul. Naturalism takes in both mind and matter; for it nature is not merely the material universe; it embraces the universe of mind as well, and when pushed to the wall it recognizes an absolute dualism; it admits that there is no way of passing in thought from matter to mind, or from mind to matter. In the language of Professor James, the relation between body and mind is that of a "blank correspondence." Naturalism is the deadliest foe of religion because it claims to cover the whole field of psychology, the whole field of human experience, and yet denies the existence and the possibility of the supernatural. This denial does away with the existence of God, the existence of the spiritual world, and the Bible as the Word of God. In these denials the entire basis of religion is swept away, and religion itself is consigned to the realm of fanciful imagination and of myth-making. The formidable character of naturalism is due to its support from a wide-embracing rationalism, a rationalism which assumes to cover the whole field of existence, when in fact it is restricted to the world of nature. It ignores the spiritual world except as the world of human minds in bodies of flesh; and so it substitutes humanistic ethics for religion.

The book contains much wholesome criticism, many admirable summaries, many penetrating observations, and occasional brilliant phraseology; but in constructive effort it is sentimental, rhetorical, and vague. The author lacks clearly-defined religious principles. His thought moves for the most part outside religion, and in the field of naturalistic humanism. The following extract seems to be his comprehensive and exhaustive declaration of faith:

> Science is the response to the human need for knowledge and power. Religion is the response to the human need for hope and certitude. One is an outreaching for mastery, the other for perfec-

tion. Both are man-made, and like man himself, are hedged about with limitations. Science can only see those things which man is equipped to see—and his equipment is sadly deficient. Man cannot transcend his own humanity. Science, vitiated by the constricted agencies of human cognition, and by the definitive organization of the human brain, cannot lay claim to an order of truth which is objective and absolute; nor can religion lay claim to perfect and final truth on the authority of some supernatural revelation. All truth comes to man by way of his mind-groping and the compelling needs and experiences of his life. (P. 34.)

This is a significant passage from the metaphysical, psychological, and religious point of view. According to it man's knowledge depends upon the organization of the brain in such a way that he cannot have knowledge of any objective truth, or reality; this implies that for him there is no objective reality. This raises the question as to the nature of knowledge and as to the meaning of objective reality. It would seem that the author is a subjective idealist. If religion cannot claim perfect and final truth on the authority of revelation, what kind and degree of truth can it claim? If all truth comes to man by way of his mind-groping, and if there is no revealed truth, how does it appear that truth *comes to man* at all, rather than that man produces his own truth by his own effort,—and thus revelation is done away with altogether? This conclusion seems to be confirmed by an earlier statement:

Science compelled religion to surrender, reluctantly enough, one by one, the myths which clustered around it, the myths of revelations, miracles, resurrections, divine books, glamorous eschatologies, and fanciful cosmologies. (P. 4.)

If the phrases "myths of revelations" and "divine books" here are meant to include the Bible, the author seems to relegate the Hebrew Bible to the realm of early tribal fancies, or deliberate forgeries. In both of these extracts we have the language of pronounced and unqualified rationalistic naturalism; and the use of such language shows how firmly this naturalism is fastened upon the leaders and the thoughtful men of our day.

The author makes use of the terms "religion" and "God" in the traditional sense, apparently for rhetorical effect; but the way he uses them raises questions as to what he really means by "religion" and "God." Here he seems to be vacillating and inconsistent. His nearest approach to a precise definition of religion is in contrasting morality with religion. He says:

> Morality is concerned with the relations of man to his fellow men. Religion is concerned with the relations of man to the Universe and to ultimate reality. (P. 53.)

If by "universe" here he means the material universe, and that the material universe is all there is, then man's relations to the universe exclude any relation to God, for in that case obviously God has no existence. On the other hand, if by "ultimate reality" he means some form of universal substance which underlies all existing things, or if he means the Idealistic Absolute, or the ineffable and unknowable "One" of Plotinus, then man's relations to ultimate reality do not include any relation to God in the religious sense of the word. Such a formula would fit into the scheme of materialism, naturalism, or atheism; but only with much question and explanation could it be fitted into the Christian religion with its personal God, known and worshipped as such. Some religious philosophies may reduce God to a universal substance,—the object of speculative thought, but not of worship. Actual religions are characterized by the worship of a personal God.

In another context, religion has a somewhat different meaning. The author is arguing for religious tolerance, and against the idea of one religion for all mankind. He maintains that there is no true religion and no false religion. Some "are out of alignment with contemporary thought," in that they "have carried over from the past a number of obsolete and discarded scientific notions."

> But every religion in so far as it conceives of the universe as the manifestation of personality and beneficence, and in so far as it impels human beings to a maximum of moral idealism, is a true religion. (P. 112.)

This statement is meant presumably to express the liberal and tolerant view of religion. But if there is no true religion and none false, there is no alternative as to true or false, and where there is no alternative there is no choice: so we are landed in the indifferentism which the author elsewhere denounces. The view that all religions are more or less true and more or less false would explain much of the liberal and tolerant sentiment in vogue at the present time; it may also explain the indifferentism towards religion, and the fact that now so many renounce religion altogether, either in conviction or in effect. For the author, however, the test of the truth of any religion is that it conceives the universe as the manifestation of personality and beneficence, and that it impels human beings to a maximum of moral idealism. Just what is meant by the universe as the manifestation of personality and beneficence is a question; and how the notion of personality can be of the universe or in the universe is also a question. Early Greek thought was crudely hylozoic, and this may have suggested Aristotle's idea of the universe as alive.

The Christian doctrine of creation implies that the universe is in origin and throughout spiritual, or perhaps personal; but this is another way of saying that the conception of the universe as the manifestation of personality is revealed. There is no evidence that any examination of the universe outside of man would lead to an idea of personality. It is true that we do observe order in the universe. Bodies move and events occur uniformly and in sequence. Some bodies move and some events occur under the impulse and direction of personality, some mechanically, some to all appearance spontaneously. The stars and planets move regularly, but mysteriously. Order implies plan, and plan implies thought; thought is a function of personality. For our present knowledge, however, there is no conceivable connection between the movements of the planets and any personal impulse and direction. The thought of personal direction or manifestation comes, not from observing the

behavior of bodies, but from revelation, from which we have the doctrine of creation. In the case of our own bodies, there is a matter of fact connection between mind and body; but in our knowledge and thought the connection is a blank correspondence. In short, to make the conception of the universe as a manifestation of personality the test of a true religion is either to accept revelation or to rest on a metaphysics which is so complicated and undeveloped as to lead to no positive results. On the other hand, to make the character of impelling human beings to a maximum of moral idealism the test, is to leave the field of religion altogether, and to fall to the merely moral level.

We have selected these points and discussed them at some length to show that the author's mind, in spite of his use of the traditional religious vocabulary and ideas, works distinctively on the plane of naturalism, and that he has no clearly defined principles with which to steer the course of religion through a changing world.

The author discusses "The Role of Religion in a Changing World," "Science and Religion," "The Church and Social Science," "The Widening Horizons of Social Service," "The Church and World Peace," "The One and The Many," "Liberalism at the Crossroads," "What is Happening to the American Home," "Education and the Good Life," and "How Shall We Measure Life?" These subjects are handled in an interesting and helpful way on the conventional level. There is good sentiment, good thinking, and stimulating suggestiveness. But there is a lack of clear and consistent religious thinking; religion is too much confused with humanism. In this respect the book belongs to the general class of infected popular expositions.

Religion in the present changing world must combine at least three indispensable features: clear and consistent thought of God; of Revelation; and of Man. The historical idea of a personal God must be clarified by new knowledge of the nature of God, and must be given its proper place in the body of modern thought. The historical acceptance of

the Bible as the Word of the Lord must be justified by new knowledge of its spiritual meaning, and of its character as a body of revealed truth about man as a spiritual being, and about his relation to God. The historical view of man as essentially an immortal spiritual being must be developed in terms of new knowledge of his metaphysical, psychological, and spiritual nature. This new knowledge we derive from the revelations given through Swedenborg, where it is concentrated in his doctrine and philosophy of love. The place of love in life and in philosophy needs to be more fully known and more completely understood, before we can meet and solve the problems of modern thought, and before we can steer the course of religion through the mazes of this changing world.

LEWIS F. HITE.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT

WHAT THE BIBLE IS, AND WHAT IT DOES FOR US.

The Bible is a unique book. It has a unique history. Its claim is unique. The Bible leads all other books in manufacture, sale, and distribution; and it has done so for many years; hundreds of millions of copies, either of the whole or of the most important parts, have been distributed in more than five hundred different languages and dialects. It has been subjected to an immense amount of criticism, interpretation, and investigation. Its text has been questioned and re-arranged. But in spite of all attempts to explain it or to discredit it, it remains a mystery, and maintains its hold upon the conscience and the affections of multitudes of mankind. It has been described as mere history, the history and literature of the Jews; and the Jews are supposed to have been peculiarly endowed with religious genius; consequently the Bible was the product of this genius. But according to the plain narrative, the Jews appear to have been for the most part irreligious rather than religious. It was not the character of the Jews that gave the Bible its religious importance, but the character of the Bible that gave the Jews their historical importance.

The character which gives the Bible its religious importance is its claim to be the Word of the Lord. The regular formula, repeated over and over, is "God spake unto Abraham," unto Isaac, unto Jacob, unto Moses, and others. In the Prophets, the form is "The Word of the Lord came unto me, saying." In the Gospels and in the Book of Revelation, the Lord speaks in His own Person. Whatever the difficulties in any theory of revelation, and however we may undertake to understand and explain these forms of speech, there they are as matter of fact; and it is this fact that first of all constitutes the claim of the

Bible to be the Word of the Lord. Men accepted this claim throughout Jewish history, and afterwards throughout Christian history. Uncounted readers have derived spiritual help and light from the Bible; and this has been for them a sufficient reason for believing it to be the Word of the Lord. They have felt and understood that in it the Lord was speaking to them.

With the inevitable development of naturalism and rationalism, the Bible has become increasingly the object of criticism and investigation. Editors and critics have labored over the text, and revised it in the light of a careful comparison of existing manuscripts. For the Old Testament, the earliest authorities are the Masoretic text and the Septuagint translation (450 and 270 B. C. respectively). The original authoritative manuscripts disappeared in the unsettled period of the Alexandrine and Roman domination. Since the ninth century various manucripts have been found. These manuscripts differ more or less; and the differences invite attempts to make an improved text, that is, an improvement upon the Masoretic text. Thus we enter the field of textual criticism and reconstruction, a field which has been assiduously and extensively cultivated, especially during the last century.

In spite of the great amount of labor in text revision, the integrity of the Bible text has with comparatively few changes been preserved; and this is true of both the New Testament and the Old Testament texts. This is witnessed by the fact that the Revised Version takes as its basis the King James Version of 1611. A comparison of the two translations shows that the texts used were virtually the same. The Bible reader may therefore feel that the verbal basis of his faith is secure.

But the Bible presents other problems besides those of the text; it presents historical and literary problems. By virtue of human participation the Bible of course has a natural history; and it is desirable and important that we should learn all we can about its natural history. This field also has been cultivated with great zeal and industry. Various theories have been proposed and developed with some questionable and some disastrous results. Rash attempts have been made to dismember and re-

arrange the Bible narrative, and to re-read Bible history. If such results are accepted, the integrity of the Bible narrative is destroyed, and thus faith in it as the Word of the Lord is impaired or subverted. If the natural history of the Bible is interpreted on the principles of naturalism and rationalism alone, the Bible itself is reduced to the level of mere tribal and national history and literature, the history and literature of the Jews. As such it would have no more claim to be the Word of God than Homer or Shakespeare. At present there is a reaction among scholars against the extremes of destructive criticism and theorizing; the tendency now is increasingly favorable to the integrity of the Bible text and of Bible history. But even in the more conservative circles, the principles of naturalism and rationalism have such a powerful influence that scholarship is constantly liable to adopt naturalistic and rationalistic interpretations and theories, and to indulge the heedless exercise of the historical imagination.

The only corrective of these tendencies is a knowledge of the spiritual and Divine as well as of the natural origin of the Bible. Here we may depend in part upon whatever spiritual interest and spiritual intelligence the Bible reader and student may possess; but in addition to this there is needed a definite body of spiritual doctrine which will lift the mind into clear spiritual light. This doctrine will include enlightenment not only on the nature of man as a spiritual being, on the nature of God and on man's relation to Him, but also on the spiritual nature of the Bible and on how the Lord spoke to man and now speaks to him in His Word. As to the spiritual nature of man, the doctrine in some form or other has been universal throughout the history of mankind that men continue to live after the death of the body. Examples of this are: the happy hunting grounds of the Indians, the Elysian fields of the Greeks, the Paradise of the Jews and Christians, etc. But aside from doctrine, philosophical and psychological tradition and reflection have made the distinction in man of body and soul, or spirit. The most complete doctrine as to the spiritual nature of man and as to the nature of the spiritual world, is that given by

Emanuel Swedenborg during the period of his labors in exposition of the spiritual nature and meaning of the Bible. In his doctrine, he describes the spiritual constitution of man and of the spiritual world in great and unexampled detail. He gives us a new and immensely complete doctrine as to the nature of God and of man's relation to Him. His doctrine enables us to understand why and how it is that the pious reader of the Bible gets spiritual light and help from it. But this body of doctrine enables us to understand further how it is that the Bible is the Word of the Lord.

According to this doctrine, the fundamental fact about the Bible, that which makes it to be the Word of the Lord, is that it has a connected spiritual meaning from beginning to end. This character imposes a restriction upon the use of the term "Bible," or more specifically upon the expression "The Word of the Lord." Those books of the Bible which have this connected spiritual meaning are, taken together, the Word of the Lord, by virtue of this fact; they are the five books of Moses, Joshua, Judges, I and II Samuel, I and II Kings, the Prophets, the Psalms, the Gospels, and the Book of Revelation. The Lord's own references to the books of the Bible enable us to fix their status. He says: "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me" (John v: 39). The character of testifying of the Lord is the criterion. This agrees with Swedenborg's formula: "The Word is about the Lord alone,"—that is, the Word in its deepest and highest sense. "And beginning at Moses and all the Prophets, He expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself" (Luke xxiv: 27). "And He said unto them, these are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning Me. Then He opened their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures" (Luke xxiv: 44, 45). If we include in the Prophets Joshua and Judges, I and II Samuel, I and II Kings, which are characterized by the utterances of the Prophets, these references of the Lord

make a list which agrees with that given above. The Four Gospels and the Book of Revelation have their place from the fact that in them the Lord is speaking in His own Person. Thus we have a new canon of Scripture based upon the character of having a connected spiritual sense; and this canon is confirmed by the Lord's own words.

The positive basis of this canon is the fact of having a spiritual sense. But how is this spiritual sense discovered? How did the Bible come to have this spiritual sense? And lastly, what is this spiritual sense?

As a matter of fact, the spiritual sense of the Bible has been recognized and appropriated all through the history of the Bible by attentive and devout readers and students, but of course in various degrees of enlightenment; the enlightenment was partial, momentary, and detached. This perception and appropriation of the spiritual sense involved the recognition of the correspondence between natural things and spiritual; it is this correspondence that gives to language its symbolic and metaphorical character. Natural objects correspond to ideas, but also to affections and thoughts: for example, the idea of a house; a man's heart may be as hard as a rock, or he may be lion-hearted; the orderly arrangement of the limbs of the cedar tree, and the thought of the orderly arrangement of ideas; etc. Language appropriates such correspondences without number. An orderly arrangement of these cases would presuppose the fact and law of correspondence.

The Bible is peculiar and unique in its embodiment of the law of correspondence in its structure. For example, take the word "sun" as used in the Bible, and follow it through from beginning to end with the knowledge that it corresponds to love, —Divine Love or human love as the case may be, and the latter unselfish or selfish according to the context. The result will be that every passage in which the word occurs will be lighted up with spiritual meaning. In the same way take the terms "moon," "horse," "sheep," "tree," "rock," "house," "ship," "Abraham," "David," "John the Baptist," and so on without number. This

experiment will be convincing that the Bible has a spiritual meaning.

But the question then arises, How did it get this meaning? This question is answered by Swedenborg in his doctrines, especially in his Doctrine of Correspondence and his Doctrine of the Word. Swedenborg affirms that he was enlightened by the Lord to see the spiritual meaning as he read the Word; and his knowledge of the nature of God and of the nature of man enabled him to understand how the Bible got its spiritual meaning, that is, the connected spiritual meaning from beginning to end. It was this connected spiritual meaning that Swedenborg was enlightened to see, and which he set forth in a general way, and more particularly in the books of Genesis, Exodus, and Revelation. The spiritual meaning of the Bible is about man's spiritual life and about the Lord's Divine-Human life. By virtue of the relation of correspondence, words referring to the things of nature and to the things of man's natural life may also refer to things of spiritual life and of the spiritual world. Accordingly, the Lord could inspire Moses, the Prophets, and other Bible writers to describe in terms of their own language and ideas what they knew of national and personal history, and at the same to express by correspondence in the description His Love and Wisdom, His Will and Thought, to a mind having a knowledge of the correspondences. From knowledge acquired during his twenty-seven years of constant and open experience in the spiritual world and in conversation with spirits and angels, Swedenborg informs us that at one time, in the days of the "Most Ancient Church," men used the language of correspondences in their ordinary familiar speech. At a later day this language was given written form, and so preserved for posterity. But in the course of time the original spiritual meaning was lost. Nevertheless by virtue of the correspondential nature of language the inner spiritual meaning was there for possible recovery. It was at this stage that the Bible writers used the language under the Lord's guidance; but they themselves had no knowledge of the correspondential meaning. In other words, the Bible writers used the language of their day

with its current meaning, and the Lord Himself fitted it to His purposes, so that it might have the meaning for us, if instructed, which He intended it to have. This in brief answers the question, How the Bible got its spiritual meaning. This answer is not obtained by the application of naturalistic and rationalistic principles; that is, the principle that only the natural world exists, and that the exercise of our rational faculties is limited to the field of nature. The explanation assumes that the spiritual world exists, and that Swedenborg was a competent witness and a truthful narrator. However, the fact and law of correspondence may be demonstrated independently of Swedenborg's testimony and authority by the nature of language and the nature of human experience. It was the formulation of the Doctrine of Correspondence, and its application to the structure and interpretation of the Bible, that gives Swedenborg his distinction and his importance.

The next question is, What is the spiritual meaning? This on its face seems a very simple question; but it is really a very difficult and complicated one. The word "spiritual" is in such common and familiar use that we seldom stop to think what we mean by it. Those who do stop and think, sometimes get so puzzled that, like the Behaviorists, e.g., Professor J. B. Watson, they conclude that man is merely a highly organized body of physical re-actions. On the other hand, the Idealists—Berkeley and the rest—assert that everything is spirit. Ever since Plato made the distinction between the sensible and the supersensible worlds, and ever since Christianity affirmed the Doctrine of Creation, thoughtful men have labored either to justify or to refute these positions. It would be out of place here to discuss these issues. Swedenborg seems to have taken the distinction between the natural and the spiritual as obvious and fundamental. By the natural he meant the physical world, including man's body and its activities; by spiritual he meant man's affections and thoughts, and the world in which man lives apart from the body. We of the New Church do not often stop to consider what all this means; it is so familiar that it does not arouse questions.

Swedenborg begins the "Arcana Cœlestia" by saying "The Word of the Old Testament contains arcana of heaven, and each and all things therein regard the Lord, His heaven, the Church, faith, and matters of faith." He adds that no one could get this from the letter or from the sense of the letter alone, and yet all things in it, "even the least, to the smallest iota, signify and involve spiritual and heavenly things." He then proceeds to give the spiritual meaning of Genesis and Exodus, chapter after chapter, and verse by verse, extending in one translation to nineteen volumes of 415 pages each with 360 words to the page, making in all about 2,836,000 words. He gives as the spiritual meaning the correspondential meaning of the words as they apply to man's spiritual life as distinguished from his natural life, and to the Lord's Divine-Human life as distinguished from His natural, bodily life in the world. For example, the "sun" means love, "lamb" means innocence, "horse" means intelligence, "eagle" means understanding, "olive tree" means perception of good, "rock" means truth, etc. The relation of correspondence may be seen in such cases by comparing the qualities of the natural object with the spiritual quality which it represents. Perhaps the best instance is that of the lamb. The lamb is characterized by gentleness, docility, and innocence; and a baby because of having these qualities is often compared with a lamb, especially as to the quality of innocence. The lamb is taken as the embodiment and type of innocent life. Spiritual innocence has the quality of gentleness towards others, and of docility with respect to the Lord. So in general we say that the lamb corresponds to innocence. This same method could be used to obtain a knowledge of correspondence in all cases of natural objects, under the law that the spiritual world is the world of causes, and the natural world the world of effects. But complications and difficulties arise with words referring to spiritual states and qualities. For example, such words as "innocence," "love," "thought," "feeling," "piety," "justice," etc. In these cases the distinction has to be made between the natural and the spiritual meaning of the word. The innocence of the lamb or of the child is natural,

but the innocence of the wise old man in his relation to the Lord is spiritual. The occurrence of these two classes of words in the Bible gives rise to difficulty in distinguishing the literal from the spiritual sense. In many cases the literal and the spiritual senses seem to coincide. It seems that it is to these cases that Swedenborg refers when he says that the spiritual sense shines through the letter. The words "thought" and "feeling" exemplify the difficulty, and the need of making the distinction. Thought about the objects of nature, and the feeling of interest in them, are distinguished as natural when contrasted with the thought of the Lord and of the qualities of His love and wisdom which are to be received and lived by us, and the feeling of affection for these, which are recognized as spiritual. It is obvious that getting the connected and consistent spiritual sense of the Bible is not an easy matter. And although men in all ages have seen and appropriated detached glimpses of the spiritual meaning, and in spite of the attempts of Philo, Origen, and Thomas Aquinas, at more or less extended exposition of some parts, no one up to the time of Swedenborg had approached the task with a general principle which could be applied in all cases, and which alone could give systematic results.

The fact and law of correspondence is such a principle; and with the help Swedenborg gives us, and in the light of his use of it, we can go to the Bible and read it with unmeasured spiritual help and enjoyment. In this way we find for ourselves that the Bible is a body of spiritual truth expressed in natural language by the law of correspondence. While in its letter the Bible is the history and literature of the Hebrews and the Jews, it is more than a natural history; and any attempt to treat it as merely natural history and literature misconceives, misrepresents, and degrades and destroys its real character. Even in its letter it is, though fragmentary, a spiritual history and literature to the extent that the Hebrews and Jews possessed and enjoyed spiritual life. Historical and literary criticism may, of course, legitimately investigate and interpret the degree of spiritual life actually possessed by the race and expressed in its literature.

But the letter of the Bible has by correspondence a spiritual meaning of a distinctly higher degree, a spiritual meaning of which the race and the Bible writers had no knowledge; and this spiritual meaning makes the Bible to be what it is, the Word of the Lord. Below this level the Bible is of the same class of literature as the poems of Homer or the dialogues of Plato, the plays of Shakespeare or the history of the French Revolution. There is a kind of spiritual life contained and described in all these, on the same level as that of the Jews, but it is not spiritual life on the level of that which by correspondence is contained and described in the Bible. There are beautiful historical and literary pictures in the Bible, and there are passages of beautiful and eloquent literary expression; but however we may enjoy this beauty and however much we may be benefited by such passages, we do not therein get the essence of the Bible, the quality, the light, and the life which makes the Bible to be in the complete, proper, and highest sense the Word of the Lord, the verbal expression of the deepest truth the Lord has given to men. It is most true that the reading of the Bible on this historical and literary level with devout feeling and appreciation does lead one to look to the Lord, to learn of Him, and to serve Him. But the Lord has more truth to give, and wants better and higher service than belongs on this level. The Lord has by correspondence provided the means of conveying this truth to men, and our means of obtaining this truth, and the light and help that come with it. For us the Bible is this body of truth, the connected spiritual meaning embodied in the letter. We are sharers with all devout Bible readers in the light and help to be had from the reading; but we who have been instructed are under obligation to the Lord to make the most of the means the Lord has provided for lifting us to higher levels of truth and life; we are also obligated to do our best to extend to others a knowledge of the means.

The doctrine that the Bible has a connected spiritual meaning based upon the fact and law of correspondence is new; but it is not new that the Bible has in general and in a fragmentary way a symbolic meaning which refers to man's spiritual life and

regeneration. The stories of Creation and of the Flood have been a stumbling block to thoughtful Bible readers for ages. The language belongs, according to Swedenborg, to a period prior to historical writing, and was taken under the Lord's guidance by Moses from documents contained in an ancient Word which used the language of pure symbol, or "pure correspondences." Swedenborg was the first to observe this character of the stories of Creation and of the Flood. A few years later a French Bible student named Astruc surmised that there were two older documents incorporated in these stories. But the stories of the Patriarchs—Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob—have been seen to have something of a symbolic meaning. The story of the Exodus has quite definitely been understood to symbolize the course of man's spiritual life in regeneration; and the land of Canaan has been taken as a symbol for heaven and the life in heaven. The Lord Himself, as is well known, spoke in parables. In this general way much of the Bible language has been understood symbolically. But when we seek to be more definite, and ask for the spiritual meaning of the stories of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, of Joseph in Egypt, of Moses and the crossing of the Red Sea, of the crossing of the Jordan and the taking of Jericho, of the conquest of Canaan and the building of the Temple, of Saul, David, and Solomon, of the division of the Tribes, of David's slaying of Goliath, of the visit of the Queen of Sheba, and of the details of persons and events which enter into these stories, a knowledge of correspondences alone, together with the enlightenment the Lord gives in the reverent use of them, will enable us to answer these questions. "Then opened He their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures." The Book of Revelation was a sealed book until Swedenborg with his knowledge of correspondences opened the meaning of the visions. Having a knowledge of the Bible correspondences, and with Swedenborg's help, we may make endless progress in learning and applying the spiritual truth of the Bible in general and in detail. The story of Saul tells us of the struggles, the successes and failures, of our religious life when we adopt the principle that our natural intelligence is the proper rule of life. The story of

David tells us of our successes and trials when we accept and apply the principle that spiritual intelligence is a sufficient guide to a knowledge of the Lord and of life from Him. The story of Solomon tells us of the glories of our spiritual life when guided by the principle that the wisdom of life is the expression of love. These examples suggest how we may apply the Bible stories in the enlightenment we get from them. In more detail, the smooth stone in David's sling is the well-tried truth of fact that with the Lord's power we may overcome the giant of self-sufficiency and self-derived intelligence. Selfishness in general is the constant and mortal enemy of spiritual life; it has either to be overcome or allowed dominion. All the wars of the Israelites represent this conflict.

What the Bible does for us is, to throw Divine light on the conflicts we must as regenerating souls wage with our selfish propensities, desires, purposes, and habits, and to show us how to get the Lord's help in the struggle. Every devout reader gets more or less of this light and help, and also gets the assurance that he may look to the Lord for the strength to overcome in every struggle. But there are struggles and temptations in which man's knowledge and light need to be raised to a higher power to insure victory. In self-sufficiency and pride of self-derived intelligence, for example, there is need for spiritual enlightenment as to the deep nature of these forms of selfishness; and this enlightenment we get from the Lord in the spiritual truth of His Word. J. J. Rousseau was a sad example of the consequences of self-sufficiency and self-derived intelligence when not recognized and not understood. He lacked the spiritual and moral intelligence to take proper care of his own children, and turned them over to the public to care for. Selfishness is suicidal; it is surfeited and stifled by the insistence and reiteration of its own demands. Spiritual life is the life of unselfish love raised to the level of spiritual intelligence. Unselfish love may be the love of natural impulse, emotion, desire, and purpose. The mother loves her child instinctively, as the hen loves her chickens. From natural affection, she puts aside her comfort and convenience, her desires and needs, and devotes herself to supplying the wants of her child. Husband and wife

naturally surrender to each other their desires, purposes, and plans, in order to please, gratify, comfort, and consult the convenience of the other. Human life is full of natural acts of kindness and service. But selfishness may assert itself above the level of these natural and spontaneous acts. Such acts may even be done with perverted intent to secure some ulterior advantage or end. In such cases they acquire an inner character of selfishness, which can only be overcome by rational and spiritual motives and knowledge. With the light of the spiritual truth of the Bible we are prepared to meet all such complications. The more interior the form of selfishness, the more need of the higher spiritual light which the Bible gives.

What the Bible does for us, then, is to transform us from natural selfish men to unselfish spiritual men, after the pattern of the angels of heaven.

The Bible, being the Lord's Word, is from the Lord; and in its deepest and highest sense it is, as Swedenborg says, the Lord, and has in it all the Lord's Love, Wisdom, and Power.

LEWIS F. HITE.

A NEW DISPENSATION

As the year 1931 came in, the Roman Catholic Church had a notable paper laid before it by the Pope. As the year 1930 expired, the New Church had a remarkable document laid before it. The New Church has no such office as the papal to issue a paper to its constituency. The Pope speaks of "looking with paternal eye on the universal world from this Apostolic See as from a watch-tower." No views can be advanced among us in the tenor in which they can be promulgated in the Catholic Church by its Visible Head. There are also other differences, of course, between the two documents, in scope and contents. We seriously feel, however, that the paper put before readers in the New Church can have more significance for us than the other may prove to have for the Catholic Church. In a survey which it makes (sketchily, it is true) of the world and of the Church's work, it outlines a platform upon which we might work towards our real goal with power. The paper we refer to is by E. C. Mongredien, and appeared in the December 27th issue of *The New-Church Herald* under the title, "A New

Dispensation That *Is* New." Every minister of the New Church, whether in England or in America, has a copy. Interested lay workers will do well if they will borrow their ministers' copies, and read the article.

Mr. Mongredien begins by glancing at the successive dispensations in our religious history on this planet. Swedenborg called these dispensations "churches," but they were obviously not ecclesiastical organizations but epochal developments of religious thought and life. The New Church as the fifth of these dispensations is essentially the same order of thing; namely, not an ecclesiastical body, but a fresh development of Christian thought and life. Deep within this, as in any such development, is an advance of God on the world, an ordering of the world by Him for a new religious era, a disposing of forces and circumstances for an unfolding of the spiritual life of a type different from previous dispensations. We have to reflect that if this is not so, we have no basis upon which to stand as *New*-Churchmen; we are laboring and preaching in vain, and are at great pains about a non-existent development.

But if the premise to which Mr. Mongredien recalls us is the premise upon which alone we have work to do, then we have a much altered world around us. We do not mean in outward aspect especially, but, for eyes that can see, in inward ways. Our mental and moral world has been reconditioned by the changes which Swedenborg says have been made in the world of the spirit. Inasmuch as the world of spirit and the present world are inseparable, these changes inevitably have expression here. In "True Christian Religion," at n. 652[3], Swedenborg says:

> There is actually a sphere proceeding continually from the Lord and filling the entire spiritual and natural world, which raises all toward heaven. It is like a strong current in the ocean which unobservedly draws a vessel. All who believe in the Lord and live according to His precepts enter that sphere or current and are elevated, while those who do not believe are unwilling to enter, but withdraw themselves to the sides and are there carried away by a current which sets toward hell.

Mr. Mongredien is contending that this perpetually active sphere is a new thing today, bearing development towards what Swedenborg calls "the new heavens." One of our serious

questions is whether we who have read of these things will give credence to the reality of this redisposition of our world by the Lord.

Mr. Mongredien finds evidences of the spiritual reconditioning of our civilization in a number of features of the modern age. He names first the fact that all the world is being swept together into an existence as a single neighborhood by the astonishing facilities for intercommunication among men.

A second item is the easy and wide interchange all over the world of the products, material and mental, of the methods of existence, of the spirit and genius of different peoples.

Again, Mr. Mongredien speaks of the fertility in invention which the present age is witnessing, of the new concepts of government which are springing up, of the striking phenomenon that not only a nation but a group of nations, like a larger man, is attempting to manage its collective affairs with the larger good of mankind for the goal.

Once again the writer in the *Herald* calls attention to the direction of modern scientific research to useful ends. That is, dominating scientific investigation, he finds an increasing spirit of use, "not as a stated doctrine, but as an informing dictate or perception."

Coming definitely to the world of religious thought and interest, Mr. Mongredien finds it distinguished by the insistence that we shall be allowed to see the truth of the spiritual life for ourselves. The human mind, he feels, will no longer permit truth to be fixed for it by some external authority, whether that be a supposedly sacred text or an ecclesiastical body affecting to speak in the name of God. The freedom of inquiry into the realities of religion has come which Swedenborg said in "The Last Judgment," at n. 73, would be one of the outstanding characteristics of the new age.

Directing our attention in another direction, Mr. Mongredien says:

> If you take the different new movements, religious and psychological, of the day, Humanism, the Brotherhood movement, faith healing, psychoanalysis, the Boy Scout movement, mechanistic psychology, education of children, the reform of the criminal, eugenics—there are hundreds of them—you will find that even when mixed with error, their leading idea

is implicit in the teachings contained in the Writings. Pierce the terminology that their votaries have clothed them in, you will find that many of their ideas are akin to the truths we profess. In each case some single truth from the New Heavens has found a spot of ground to rest in, and its light-giving power is beginning to shine through.

Mr. Mongredien might very well have proceeded at this point to a survey of the more solid body of modern religious thought, in and out of the churches, and of this, too, have said the same thing.

There is good counsel in Mr. Mongredien's exhortation to us, not only to keep to the large characteristics of the new day, but to look not so much for errors and irreligious trends as for evidences that the Lord is making His Second Coming. We believe that this great event is taking place. Can it be without effects in the world at large, of the sort which Mr. Mongredien recites? We are persuaded that "the Lord Jesus Christ reigns." Can we then look at the world about us, and find it empty of all evidence of that fact?

Mr. Mongredien's discussion is interested chiefly in how our religious bodies are to conduct themselves towards this striking movement in the life and thought of our day, which, when it does not embody, at least reflects that advance of the spirit of the Lord on the world which we speak of as the Second Coming.

Mr. Mongredien has good things to say of the worship which the Church carries on, stimulating to the spiritual life which the Lord is now offering men. He recognizes the large place of the teaching ministry in a religious body which would serve the fresh development of Christian thought and life to which the Second Coming moves. Over and above these and other accustomed activities of ours, he urges one definite effort which we are not making. This is to encourage, even to train men whose ministry will take the form of writing for the Church. Swedenborg felt that the press was a Providential agency in the religious work of the new day. He himself entrusted his message quietly and confidently to circulation in books. Mr. Mongredien urges that more men and better equipped men attempt the interpretation of the message of the New Church to the world of contemporary religious thought.

Quite the pith of Mr. Mongredien's paper is to be found, however, in what he has to say on the adjustment of our New-Church organizations, not only to the age, but to what he feels is already forward in our religious world; namely, an attested return of Christ. This he would have our organizations see. This he would have us hail with joy. He would have us help with it. He thinks our mission might well be summed up as the effort to give the incipient spiritual life and thought of the Second Coming a measure of self-understanding. It is to these ends that he feels the doctrines of the Church should be utilized, and at this point he is fairly blunt.

> I suggest in fact that we are delivering our message in a wrong way. We have received it in old Church vessels; we are carrying it on in old Church vessels. We are proclaiming it as a formal body of doctrine to be received in the old Church credal and ecclesiastical sense. We have so far not risen to the full realization of what an internal dispensation is to mean.

But if we have not a body of doctrine which is to be advanced for acceptance in the traditional fashion, what have we in the doctrines of the Church, in Mr. Mongredien's view? It is a body of truth to be inquired into, a body of truth to be utilized for light in which to attempt solutions of prevalent questions. It is a new statement of Christian faith with which to work. Only as we employ the doctrines for recognizing in the first place the spiritual life which is astir at the hands of the Lord in His Second Coming, and then for arousing that life further and interpreting it, shall we be doing justice to this body of teaching.

Mr. Mongredien is sounding a much needed summons to the Church to attach and devote itself to its true cause in the world. The life of which the doctrines speak does not come in the wake of an acceptance of those doctrines. It is of the Lord's initiation in the hearts of men. It is now astir. It shows itself in new aspirations and in insights far removed from the traditional Christian teaching. To herald to the world this fresh Christian development for what it is, and to empower it with some intellectual exposition of itself, is what the New-Church organizations have for their mission.

William F. Wunsch.

BIBLICAL AND DOCTRINAL STUDIES

THE THEOLOGICAL WORKS AND TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF THE BIBLE

II. Swedenborg's Treatment of the Bible Text

In the New-Church Review, January, 1930, we offered some introductory reflections on the mutual relations of the Theological Works and textual study of the Bible. We cited and considered typical statements of those Works on the condition of the Bible text. We also gave one or two examples of the Revelator's actual dealing with the text.

Swedenborg's statements are to the effect that the text of Scripture has been preserved with all accuracy, to the single word, and even to the single letter. Presumably this assertion was made of the text which he had before him, and with which he worked; namely, the Masoretic Text of the Old Testament and the Received Text of the New. And yet we do not find that he adopted the traditional text outright. He deviated from it. If it has been preserved with minute accuracy, and "there has been no mutilation of the sense of the letter of the Word from its first revelation, not even in a word or letter in the original text" (Apocalypse Explained, n. 1085[3]), there is of course no occasion to deviate from it. Yet Swedenborg departed on occasion from the pointing or vocalizing of the Masoretic text; he departed from the consonantal text as transmitted by the Masoretes; and he departed from the Received Text in the New Testament. We noted an instance of each departure; more instances could be cited. A single deviation, however, is sufficient to call in question the flawlessness of the text from which the deviation is made. All of which is to say that Swedenborg's practice diverges from his statements about

the condition of the text; we cannot at one and the same time adopt his statements and his practice.

We might add that Swedenborg's statements about the condition of the Bible text reflected the thought of his day (he seized upon what was then deemed to be a fact, to illustrate the Providence which indubitably presided over the Bible, a Providence amply illustrated, however, if the text has been preserved, as it has, with supreme trustworthiness, though not without flaw). The Revelator's practice, on the other hand, accords more nearly with the outlook and procedure of current Bible study.

In the article referred to we expressed the hope that we might make some further studies in this interesting and little investigated field of Swedenborg's treatment of the Scripture text. We proceed to these studies now. These also are only preliminary studies, pieces of reconnoitering in the large volume of Swedenborg's Bible exposition. Swedenborg's working attitude to the Bible text naturally disclosed itself in the course of his expositions and citations—what was it?

For the most part, of course, Swedenborg did not depart from the Masoretic Text in the Old Testament, or from the Received in the New, just as, for the most part, our English versions and even our most modern translations do not depart from them. Indeed, our accumulated textual materials, and among them the more reliable MSS available since Swedenborg's day, do not prompt departure from these texts except at given points. In general, therefore, Swedenborg's adherence to the accepted texts presents no question. Only when he adheres to these texts where the evidence now leads us to alter them, shall we have to study his adhesion to them. One of our main inquiries, accordingly, will be into readings which Swedenborg did not change, or in which he saw no need of emendation, but in which our accumulated textual evidence calls for change ("C" below). Our other main inquiry will be into changes which Swedenborg introduced or seemed to introduce into the accepted texts ("B" below). The present paper is making only reconnoiterings, as we have said, on these points, and seeks

whatever answers offer themselves. We do little more than assemble some data for determining the mutual relations of the Theological Works and textual study of the Bible.

A. Changes in Text Inadvertently Made

We have not noted among our questions above, one to which, however, we need to address ourselves first of all. Are any changes which Swedenborg made in the traditional texts, inadvertently made? Are any of them pieces of miswriting? We shall not want to take such changes for intended re-readings, but put them to one side.

Readers of the Latin editions of the Theological Works are aware that in the composition of his own works Swedenborg very occasionally miswrote himself. If they have glanced at the last pages of a Latin reprint, they have found lists of miswritings on Swedenborg's part which the editor of the reprint indicates he has set right. Errors on the part of the printer of the original edition are also listed, of course; but we have in mind now miswritings on Swedenborg's own part, often substantiated in the photolithographs of his MSS. A number of these miswritings are insubstantial grammatical lapses. The editor has come upon an ungrammatical "*illam*," for example, and printed "*illum*"; "*dedit*," and printed "*dederunt*," as the syntax requires. Figures in references as given in the original Latin edition were sometimes miswritten, and the editor of the reprint corrects them. But at times miswritings were more substantial. In "True Christian Religion," n. 840, Swedenborg referred to Augustine as Bishop of Hippo in "the third century," placing that Christian leader nearly two centuries out of the way. He surely did so inadvertently; and it is strange that editors and translators have not seen fit to set so obvious a matter right. So Swedenborg wrote "internal" where the context shows that he meant "external" (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 1200e), "rational" where he meant "natural" (n. 3509), "the Divine itself" where he meant "the Divine Human" (n. 3210), "man" where he meant "Lord," "truth" where he intended "good" (Doctrine of Faith, n. 13). Such miswriting occurs, it

is to be noticed, not only in works which he did not publish, and may not have revised for the printer, but in books, too, which he prepared for the press.

We note such inadvertences in the composition of Swedenborg's own text, to give weight to the suggestion that there may occasionally be similar miswriting in his quotations of Scripture.

We have an illustration at "Apocalypse Revealed," n. 298. Quoting Genesis xlix. 17, Swedenborg wrote "horse" where the text has "rider." He misquoted in the same way at "Apocalypse Explained," n. 581[11]. Editors and translators correct silently or with a note. Swedenborg quoted the verse correctly elsewhere, and at the number mentioned in "Apocalypse Explained" corrected his reading when he came to interpret. At "Arcana Cœlestia," n. 9643, in quoting Psalm xviii. 15, Swedenborg wrote "city" where the Hebrew has "world." He quoted the verse as in the Hebrew at nn. 8286 and 9818 of the same work. The inadvertences in such instances are plain.

We turn to another Scripture quotation, where it has seemed possible to regard Swedenborg's miswriting as an emendation of the Bible text. The Authorized Version represents the Masoretic text of Isaiah ix. 21 as follows:

> Manasseh, Ephraim; Ephraim, Manasseh: and they together shall be against Judah.

Quoting this verse at "Apocalypse Explained," nn. 386[2] and 440[4], Swedenborg wrote "Jehovah" in place of "Judah." The present writer would not himself cite this unpublished work as against the "Arcana Cœlestia," n. 5354[11], where Swedenborg wrote "Judah." But there are those who have considered the form of quotation in the former work to be not a miswriting, but an intended change. Yet no text of the Hebrew Bible reads "Jehovah." The reading yields no sense. It destroys the meaning which the passage has when left unaltered. For this verse and the one preceding it are predicting civil war in Israel, Manasseh against Ephraim, and Ephraim against Manasseh, and the two tribes against Judah. The inclination to insist that Swedenborg was emending the text probably grows out of the fact that where he misquoted he also went on (in one instance)

to interpret the miswritten Scripture. But can the change be intended by any possibility? Is not Le Boys des Guays right when he treats this not as an intended change, but says that Swedenborg allowed a thought from the deeper sense to creep into his rendering of the text? In the deeper sense Jehovah *is* in mind. The change of reading was unintentionally made. In this very natural view Dr. Samuel H. Worcester joined Le Boys des Guays.

We find a similar unintended change of reading in Swedenborg's quotation of Isaiah xxxii. 17. The Authorized Version renders the Masoretic Text accurately:

> And the work of righteousness shall be peace: and the effect of righteousness quietness and assurance forever.

Three times in quoting the verse (Apocalypse Revealed, n. 306, Apocalypse Explained, n. 365[40], and True Christian Religion, n. 303), Swedenborg wrote "Jehovah" in place of "righteousness" (at the first occurrence of the word in the verse). Once more this has no textual support anywhere. Once more the sense of the passage is spoiled. Once more Le Boys des Guays reflected sensibly that the thought of "Jehovah" slipped into the quotation of the passage out of the deeper meaning which Swedenborg was expounding. Once more Dr. Samuel H. Worcester agreed with him. But Mr. Noble, Mr. Hindmarsh, and Dr. Rudolph Tafel all thought that Swedenborg intended the change, just as they thought that he intended the similar change in Isaiah ix. 21, of which just above. Dr. Tafel even said that "Swedenborg removed spurious readings in these passages." Were this true, Dr. Tafel's own theory of the preservation of the Bible text would be disproved then and there. His theory was that the Scripture text has been "quantitatively" preserved, that is, as to the number of letters, though not always "qualitatively," as to the words to be made of the indicated number of letters. Here and there a wrong word might stand in the Masoretic text, but the right word would be one with the number of letters found in the text. In each of the two passages, however, in which Dr. Tafel says Swedenborg

removed spurious readings, Swedenborg's alleged emendation is a word with fewer letters than are found in the text.

How many unintended changes in Scripture text will one meet in the Theological Works? We cannot always hope to check them by other quotations in Swedenborg himself as readily as we have these. Is it not plain that we must be careful not to mistake possible miswritings for a deliberate recasting of the text? We list a few other instances of miswriting of Scripture texts: of Habakkuk i. 8, at "Arcana Cœlestia," n. 3901[7]; of Psalm lxviii. 17, at "Arcana Cœlestia," n. 3186 (checked by n. 2575[2]); of Isaiah liv. 4, at "Apocalypse Revealed," n. 483, and "Apocalypse Explained," n. 331[4]; of Psalm xxxvi. 6, at "Sacred Scripture," n. 85; of Hosea vi. 3, at "Apocalypse Explained," n. 644[23]; of Luke xiv. 14e, at "Arcana Cœlestia," n. 2371[4] (checked by n. 6393[2]).

Two questions have appeared incidentally to the discussion above which we reserve for a later paper. One is whether there are other instances in which, as in the Isaiah passages above, Swedenborg lets the thought of the spiritual sense into his rendering of the text, without, however, meaning to give a different form to the text. The other is whether Swedenborg ever bases his interpretation of the Word's deeper meaning upon a miswritten Scripture. The latter question will broaden —does he ever base interpretation upon an intentionally changed reading which, however, is unsupported by textual evidence?

B. Changes Made by Swedenborg in the Traditional Texts

One of our main inquiries, as we said, must be into changes which Swedenborg introduced into the accepted texts of Scripture; perhaps we cannot say deliberately, but at least they are not pieces of miswriting. As it may turn out that he was only following Schmidius, his Latin guide, we shall classify these re-readings according to whether he reproduced Schmidius in them or not. For convenience in referring to our data, we use numerals for our main classifications, and small letters for our illustrative Scripture quotations.

1. Are there Scripture passages, in the text of which Swedenborg followed Schmidius, but departed from the traditional text?

a) We referred in our article of a year ago to a re-reading in Deuteronomy xxviii. 22. At the point in this passage where the Masoretic text reads "sword" Swedenborg wrote "drought" (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 8364[3]). He reproduced Schmidius in this. For this reading the consonants of the Hebrew text remain unaltered, but the vocalizing has to be changed. Besides the consonantal Masoretic text there is other textual warrant for the reading "drought"; both the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Vulgate have it. We have no evidence that Swedenborg guided himself by these versions. The general sense of the passage itself also invites some such reading as "drought."

b) We have a second example of our present class of re-readings—in which Swedenborg followed Schmidius but departed from the Masoretic text—in his quotation of Isaiah ix. 3. The Authorized Version, which adheres to the Masoretic Text, runs:

> Thou hast multiplied the nation, and not increased the joy: they joy before thee according to the joy in harvest, as men rejoice when they divide the spoil.

How many readers have felt that there is something amiss in the verse! They have welcomed the Revised Version:

> Thou hast multiplied the nation, thou hast increased their joy; they joy before thee according to the joy in harvest, as men rejoice when they divide the spoil.

What is out of place is the negative before "increased." It nullifies the general sense of the verse. Swedenborg, as the Revised Version does, dropped the "not." Rather, he read (Arcana Cœlestia, nn. 125[9]2, 9250[5]) the word as the footnote in the Masoretic text reads it, as a pronoun, "to him" or "to it," rendered in the possessive which stands before "joy." In this he followed Schmidius. That is, he departed from the reading in the body of the Masoretic text. We shall return to this passage a little later.

c) Quoting Isaiah xix. 18e at "Arcana Cœlestia," nn. 402[4]

and 1462, and also elsewhere, Swedenborg read "city of the sun" where the Masoretic text has "city of destruction." He was reproducing Schmidius, but in so doing departed from the Masoretic text. It is to be said that the general sense of the passage calls for a favorable characterization of the city in question, like "city of the sun," rather than an unfavorable one, like "city of destruction." Some Hebrew MSS also have "cheres" (here rendered "sun") and not, like the Masoretic Text, "heres" ("destruction"); the Vulgate implies a Hebrew text with a reading like that of the MSS mentioned.

Of these three re-readings in Swedenborg (1 a, b, and c) three things are true: they are reproductions of Schmidius, departures from the Masoretic Text, and readings attested by other textual evidence. The other textual evidence is the consonantal Masoretic text as distinguished from the vowel text, the reading in a footnote of the Masoretic text, the Samaritan Pentateuch, some Hebrew MSS, and the Vulgate.

2. Are there Scripture passages, in the text of which Swedenborg followed Schmidius, in which by so doing he departed from the Masoretic text, and in which his re-readings lack support from textual evidence? This would mean that Schmidius in the first place had no textual warrant for his rendering.

a) At Amos iii. 12, we read in the Authorized Version:

> So shall the children of Israel be taken out that dwell in Samaria in the corner of a bed, and in Damascus in a couch.

The Revised Version reads the concluding words as "on the silken cushions of a couch," for the Revisers took the Hebrew word rendered "Damascus" in A V, to mean silken stuff of the kind reputed to come from Damascus. Three times in the "Arcana" (nn. 3869^{10}, 6188^{2}, 10050^{2}), Swedenborg wrote still differently, "in the corner of a bed, and on the end of a couch." This is Schmidius exactly, but it is not the Masoretic text, or any known Hebrew text. Did Swedenborg mean to offer an emendation? Was he only following Schmidius? The question is to the fore especially in our present class of Bible quotations in the Theological Works. The text does require emendation. In the Hebrew the mooted word (variously rendered "Damas-

cus" and "silken cushions"; Swedenborg substitutes the word "end") is unreadable as it stands.

b) We have another example in Swedenborg's quotation of Amos iv. 3. Literally the Masoretic text reads, "And ye shall cast to the Harmon." Schmidius translated, "And ye shall throw down the palace." Swedenborg (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 4926[6]) reproduced him exactly. The mooted word in the original resembles the word for "palace," but is not that word; we know no locality with the name of Harmon; ancient versions and modern translations offer such a variety of readings as "Harmon," "Mt. Hermon," "Armenia," "the refuse-heap," and "Hadad-Rimmon." The Vulgate has "Harmon." Swedenborg's (Schmidius's) reading would involve an emendation of the Masoretic text. (Incidentally, either one of these Amos verses calls in question the statement that the Scripture text has been preserved without the mutilation of a word.)

3. What changes, if any, did Swedenborg make in the text of Scripture in which he departed from Schmidius and also from the Masoretic Text, though with textual warrant elsewhere? Our investigations have not led us as yet to any such re-readings which we are ready confidently to classify so. In any case we may expect them to be rare. For Swedenborg, choosing for his guidance Schmidius's Latin version because it reproduced the original so well, obviously purposed to rely on it. If he was to leave it, moreover, it would be in order to render the Hebrew or Greek original still more faithfully. Verbal departure from Schmidius, like use of a different synonym, of course Swedenborg made often; substantial departure, even in the interests of closer adherence to the original, infrequently. Of the latter we have an example in his quotation of Revelation i. 5c. Schmidius wrote "washed us from our sins through His name" (it is a curious question where he found any Greek text for "through His name"). Swedenborg changed into agreement with the Received Text, and translated "by His blood." The infrequency of substantial divergence from Schmidius to be closer to the Masoretic Text or to the Received Text leads us to expect even less frequent

divergence which involves departure from those texts, though there may be other textual warrant for it.

4. We have also come upon no changes in reading by Swedenborg, in which he left both Schmidius and the traditional texts, and for which there is no textual evidence. Re-readings with no textual warrant for them are still less to be expected than such as we described at 3. Swedenborg was at least not unmindful of textual warrants, as "Apocalypse Revealed," n. 95, shows.

C. Changes Not Made by Swedenborg, for Which Evidence Calls

There are changes which Swedenborg did not make in the traditional texts, but for which textual evidence today calls. Unless we bring before us passages of this character, too, we shall not have all the data for determining the mutual relations of the Theological Works and textual Bible study. Any one acquainted with textual study of the Bible takes for granted that Swedenborg, or any other worker so many years ago, made no changes in a number of Scripture passages where now the accumulated evidence calls for a change, or at least indicates the need of emendation, although it has as yet produced no convincing emendation. Of the variants from the traditional texts of which we now know, very few came to Swedenborg's attention, if indeed any did; and the need or possibility of emendation at many points, even in passages with which he dealt, did not seem to urge itself upon him.

a) When, for example, Swedenborg quoted Isaiah ix. 3, as above, p. 000, and read a pronoun from the footnote rather than the negative in the body of the Masoretic Text, he was dealing with a text which invites a still different and convincing emendation. The two letters, read now as a negative, and now as a pronoun, draw attention really to a disturbance of the text. Students have felt that these two letters, whatever they are (there is no question about the first of them), are in fact neither negative nor pronoun, but the ending broken off the preceding word which, as it stands, is "nation." Attach the letters to it,

and the result is a word meaning "joy." Then the passage reads:

> Thou hast multiplied the joy, and increased the gladness; they joy before thee according to the joy in harvest, as men rejoice when they divide the spoil.

Note that the general thought of the verse is that God has increased the people's rejoicing—increase of the nation is an extraneous thought. Note that the emended reading gives the required poetical balance. It results, moreover, in one of those pairs of expressions ("joy" and "gladness") which Swedenborg remarks are so frequent in Isaiah. The emendation is slight, altering the consonantal text very little.

b) We turn next to another passage which we noted above, Revelation i. 5. "Washed us from our sins," the verse reads in part. It reads so in the Received Text, in Schmidius, and in Swedenborg's quotations. The far greater weight of textual evidence is for a slightly changed Greek text which gives us "loosed us from our sins."

c) For a third example of Scripture passages affected by textual findings since Swedenborg's day, but accepted by him as he found them, we turn to a notable passage outside those Scripture books which he says have a spiritual sense, and therefore outside the body of texts with which he had to do in exposition of that sense. This passage is 1 John v. 7:

> For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.

These words, we now know, were originally a Latin gloss in some MS or MSS; after a time they were translated into Greek; and not so long before Swedenborg they appeared for the first time in the body of Greek MSS as a part of the epistle. That the words did not stand originally in the epistle was unrealized in Swedenborg's day. He quoted them as part of the epistle, in the course of a demonstration of the fact that there is a Trinity. Some of our men have found them a rather strongly tri-theistic assertion, and have intimated that we should be glad to have them out of the way. But our point now is

that they are a spurious passage, for the deletion of which our present textual knowledge calls. Swedenborg had no evidence to apprize him of the standing of the passage, and quoted it as though it were a genuine part of the epistle. Textual changes elsewhere which are not so obvious nor so drastic as this, may be called for with equal cogency.

d) We add a few more examples. Hosea iv. 10, 11, is a passage which rather plainly asks for re-reading. In the Authorized Version it runs:

> For they shall eat, and not have enough: they shall commit whoredom, and shall not increase: because they have left off to take heed to the Lord.
> Whoredom and wine and new wine take away the heart.

Strictly the Hebrew of the first verse concludes: "They have forsaken the Lord to observe." And strictly the syntax does not permit of the Authorized Version's translation. When Swedenborg quoted the verse (Apocalypse Revealed, n. 134, Apocalypse Explained, n. 141), he skipped the word in the Hebrew which the Authorized Version renders by "to take heed." There is in fact no way to fit this word in unless the verses are redivided, and the first word of verse 11, "whoredom," is read as the last word of verse 10. Then, as rendered in "The Old Testament: an American Translation," the passage runs:

> And they shall eat, and not be satisfied;
> They shall play the harlot, and not be fruitful;
> Because they have forsaken the Lord, to practise harlotry.
>
> Wine and new wine have taken away the understanding.

This makes good sense. The Masoretic text is essentially unaltered, and only the late verse-division is rectified. Even such a small change as this went unmade in the Theological Works, where the verses are quoted half a dozen times or so. It is a superficial change compared with the changes which those Works did make in the Amos passages quoted above, 2a and b.

e) Amos vi. 12, illustrates the possibility of another kind of emendation. As this verse stands in the Masoretic Text, its second half makes no sense:

> Shall horses run upon the rock? will one plough with oxen?

A word has to be supplied in the latter clause or question, to make it the absurd question it is supposed to be; and the Authorized Version renders, "Will one plow there with oxen?" The word "there," however, does not stand in the Hebrew. It is also apparent that a triple balance has been destroyed, between "horses" and "oxen," "run" and "plough," "rock" and—what? A textual critic not many years ago noted that the word for "oxen," a collective singular with a plural meaning, wore, as it rarely does, a plural ending, and it came to him that this plural ending was properly a separate word—the word for "sea." Repointing the Hebrew, but not altering the consonantal text, he read:

> Shall horses race over crags,
> Or oxen plough the sea? (Moffatt)

Swedenborg, following Schmidius, translated the Masoretic Text as it stands (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 5895[4], Apocalypse Explained, n. 355[34]).

f) One more instance in our present class of passages. The Received Text of Revelation viii. 13 reads, as translated in the Authorized Version:

> And I beheld, and heard an angel flying through the midst of heaven.

Both Schmidius and Swedenborg have this reading. No other text had come to either's attention. But more authentic MSS which have become available offer a different reading:

> Then I looked, and I heard an eagle flying in mid-heaven. (Moffatt.)

The preceding verses have been speaking of angels, and this verse would speak more naturally of "another angel" than of "an angel," as though one were mentioned for the first time in the chapter. It would be the first appearance of an eagle in the chapter. The two words in Greek are not unlike, and could be interchanged. It is a textual canon that copyists are more likely to replace a less expected reading like "eagle" here with an easier reading like "angel," than an easier with a less expected. Students consider that on these various grounds the evidence for "eagle" is stronger than for "angel." The writer's impression is that, on looking at Swedenborg's interpretation of the

spiritual sense of the verse, we may well decide that the reading "eagle" affords a more precise basis for it than the reading "angel."

With these five passages we content ourselves at present, in illustrating Scripture readings in which the available evidence would now call for changes, but about changes in which the Theological Works are silent. If we are to determine the mutual relations of these Works and textual Bible criticism, we certainly must include a consideration of this class of passage. The probability is that they will offer us our more extended inquiry.

Reflections on Our Data

It is only on the basis of an assemblage of data such as this, though it should be a very much more extensive one, that we can address ourselves definitely to the question how the Theological Works and textual criticism of the Bible bear upon each other. We have tried to gather a few first facts, and to arrange some of the problems. We purpose to examine much more ground, and to inquire into some other questions, before we are ready to form or offer any conclusions at large. Some reflections are possible on the data above, however.

Eventually our problem may be, how far Swedenborg intended to deal with textual questions, or whether he intended that his work should settle such questions. Both Mr. Hindmarch and Dr. Rudolph Tafel felt that the authority of Swedenborg's statements is the true issue, and in the sense just indicated this may be so. If we mean that Swedenborg's statements—those on the condition of the text—must just be adopted, we also have the fact to deal with that statements and practice in the Theological Works diverge. Mr. Noble and Mr. Bruce did not feel that the authority of revelation attached to statements about the condition of the Bible text, for this condition is a natural and observable fact. All these men joined in giving every weight to the form which Swedenborg gave a text, as though Swedenborg intended to enter the field of textual criticism. Our question about his authority resolves itself into a question, then, about his intention in the matter.

In view of even the slight but varied data which we have gathered above, is it possible to say that Swedenborg meant to deal with textual questions? Incidentally, his work, like any Bible work, was sure to fall within the field of these problems; and therefore in the article of a year ago we spoke of his work as a limited pursuit of textual criticism. Probably even that is overstatement. Did he consciously concern himself with such problems? Or intend even incidentally or by implication in his work as Revelator to give answers to them?

Very much in his treatment of the Bible passages which we have considered above negatives the idea. What we have said under "C" indicates that textual problems which are active ones did not come to his attention. In texts like Amos iv. 3 and iii. 12 (at 2, a and b), Swedenborg was confronted with faulty texts, but offered no textual comment. Amos iv. 3, contains a word which is unreadable, and which has resisted convincing emendation. Had Swedenborg given help with it, he would have given evidence of critical purpose. He would have given evidence of such a purpose again, if, in making departures from the Masoretic Text which are attested elsewhere (at 1, a-c), he had mentioned this textual warrant which exists for them. As it is, in all likelihood, he was following Schmidius. Once again, if it turns out that there are no such changes of text in the Theological Works as we describe at 3 above—departures from both Schmidius and the accepted texts—that in itself will be evidence of the absence of critical purpose, for textual criticism cannot fail to depart from these texts at a number of points.

The Amos passages (at 2) arouse another reflection. In them Swedenborg held to Schmidius, deviated from the Masoretic Text, and has no support in textual evidence. In "Apocalypse Revealed," n. 95, he refrained from interpreting a passage, because he thought it was omitted from some MSS. Acting on the same principle, what would he do in the Amos passages, if he realized that for the text he used he had no textual evidence at all? "Apocalypse Revealed," n. 95, also means that Swedenborg left textual questions, when he recognized their presence,

to be dealt with by study of the MSS, etc.;—in other words the passage is a disavowal of textual criticism on his own part.

We are also naturally moved to wonder whether the same man who entertained the thought that the text of Scripture has been preserved to us with all accuracy could be purposing any textual criticism. The adoption of a Latin version (Schmidius) for the reason that it reflected the accepted texts so well, is in itself evidence of the absence of critical purpose. When Swedenborg holds to Schmidius though that means departing from the accepted texts, it is his confidence in his Latin guide which is evidenced. When he departs from Schmidius, the one intention evidenced is that he plans to translate with even greater fidelity to the accepted texts than Schmidius did.

The trend of reflections like these is that in the light of Swedenborg's own dealings with the Bible text, we shall have to say that the determination of textual questions rests where "Apocalypse Revealed," n. 95, rests it—with the testimony of the MSS, or with textual evidence in general. That passage is Swedenborg's one explicit reckoning with textual questions; and too much cannot be made of the principle of action which it discloses on this whole subject. Can Swedenborg rightly be regarded as doing a work which he did not intend to do?

William F. Wunsch.

CURRENT LITERATURE

"THE U. S. LOOKS AT ITS CHURCHES."*

In accordance with action of the U. S. Government in 1902, every ten years a census is taken of all the churches in the forty-eight states of the Union. There have been three such censuses taken,—those of 1906, 1916, and 1926. If we turn to the publications of the Government based upon information thus collected the last time, we learn much about the present condition of the various church organizations, under such headings as "Statistics," "History," "Doctrine," "Organization," and "Work." But in addition to this published information there is much additional information of great interest that may be derived from the Census returns. The little book before us—"The U. S. Looks at Its Churches," by C. Luther Fry—presents information derived from both published and unpublished data. As the author prepared the official analysis of church figures for the summary volume of the 1926 "Census of Religious Bodies" published by the Government, he was presumably the most competent person to make a profitable study of all such data for our enlightenment in many lines. In the present volume statistical tables are relegated to seventy pages in the latter half of the book; the readable analysis of what those tables disclose is set forth in the first half of the book, and made forceful to the eye by numerous readily comprehensible charts.

The subjects dealt with in the successive chapters of the treatise are as follows: (I) Introduction; (II) What Proportion of Americans Belong to Church? (III) To What Denominations Do People Belong? (IV) How Are Churches

**The U. S. Looks at Its Churches.* By C. Luther Fry. New York: Institute of Social and Religious Research. c. 1930. 200 pp., 8vo., with charts and tables. Cloth, $2.50.

Geographically Distributed? (V) How Rapidly Are Churches Growing? (VI) Is the Sunday School Declining? (VII) To What Extent Are Ministers Academically Trained? (VIII) What Is the Value of Church Property? and (IX) How Much Do Churches Spend? On some of these subjects we shall attempt to give a few summary points of general interest. As a considerable part of the information involves a distinction between city and country conditions, it needs to be known at the outset that the dividing line between urban and rural communities is set at 2500 population per center. On that basis the Government classes 72 per cent of all churches as rural.

Statistics show that during the twenty years from 1906 to 1926 the nation's adult church membership ("adult" in this case meaning persons thirteen years of age or over) increased at almost exactly the same rate as its adult population. The total church membership on that basis is about 55 per cent of the total population, and involves 48 per cent of the men and 63 per cent of the women of the nation.

The Government statistics for 1926 give figures for 212 denominations, involving 232,000 churches, and 44,380,000 members thirteen years old or over. Of every hundred such members 62 are Protestant, 30 are Roman Catholic, and 6 are Jews. The ratio of women to men in white congregations is 5 to 4, and in negro congregations 3 to 2, relatively fewer negro men being connected with churches than white men,—a fact that has a bearing upon the supposition that the negro temperament is more inclined to religious observances than the white. On the basis of church population the negroes have about twice as many churches as the whites, having one church to 178 members, as contrasted with one to 340 members. Of course the negro churches are numerous only in the South.

Most of the 212 denominations are small, fifty having less than 1000 members, the next fifty less than 5000, and the next half-dozen or so less than 7000, so that more than half of all the denominations have less than 7000 members. There are but 24 denominations with more than 200,000 members; and

jointly these 24 constitute over 90 per cent of the nation's membership.

The average rural church has 98 adult members, occupies a church building worth $6200, total annual expense involved being $1400, or $13.27 per member. The average urban church has 433 adult members, occupies a building worth $53,500, total annual expense being $10,000, or $21.50 per member. As a general rule 80 per cent of the money collected goes for self-support. Of all the denominations 22 reported expending 90 per cent for self-support, while 22 others reported expending over 50 per cent on "benevolences" of various sorts, the highest per cent in the latter line being that of the Seventh Day Adventists, who practice tithing, do not pay their ministers a salary, and give to "benevolences" over 80 per cent.

While the increase in the number of church members has kept pace with the increase in population during the twenty years under consideration, the proportion of church edifices has steadily decreased. In 1906 there was a church to every 270 members, in 1916 one to every 300 members, and in 1926 one to 344. Some strong denominations had fewer churches in 1926 than in 1906. The Roman Catholic Church has had a rapid increase in its churches, though the pace of the first decade under consideration was over three times as fast as that of the second period, as shown by totals of 12,472 for 1906, 17,375 for 1916, and 18,940 for 1926.

Nearly four-fifths of all churches reported having Sunday schools, the increase in number of schools being from 168,000 in 1906 to 185,000 in 1926. Of the youth population under 19 years of age, 40 per cent were enrolled in Sunday schools in 1906, 48 per cent in 1916, and 44 per cent in 1926. In 1906 the enrollment was 14,686,000, in 1916 it was 19,936,000 (an increase of 3.57 per cent), and in 1926 21,000,000 (an increase over 1916 of but 5.5 per cent). Of the total enrollment, 26 per cent were over 21 years of age, and 10 per cent were under 6. The average Sunday school has 114 pupils enrolled, this average varying from 76 in rural communities to 210 in cities, the number of officers and teachers averaging 9 in the

country sections and 19 in the cities. As was the case in church membership as compared with number of churches, the tendency has been upward—88 to each school in 1906, 107 in 1916, and 114 in 1926. The Christian Science organization holds the record of increase by a very long lead, having reported 16,000 pupils in 1906, and 141,000 in 1926. The Sunday schools of the Roman Catholic Church have declined remarkably in enrollment, this being due to the increase in parochial school during the same period, in which more or less religious instruction is a part of the regular school life each day.

Perhaps the chapter that will most impress the average reader of this volume is that concerning the education of the nation's clergy. An analysis has been made of the ministers of 21 of the leading denominations, representing 74 per cent of all churches, the total individuals involved being 71,500 clergymen of 17 white Protestant bodies, 11,750 priests of the Roman Catholic Church, and 21,600 ministers of 3 negro organizations,—or nearly 105,000 in all. Eleven of the denominations (including 4 of the largest) report that more than half of their rural ministers have never attended either college or seminary; and the 17 white Protestant bodies report that even in cities one-fifth have lacked such education. Of the entire 21 denominations, 3 out of 8 of the ministers of the 18 white denominations, and 3 out of 4 of the ministers of the 3 colored denominations, are reported as having had neither college nor seminary training. As regards professional training, the Roman Catholic priests have by far the best showing, only 6.6 per cent being of as low a standard of education as we are now considering, while 68 per cent claim graduation from both college and seminary. Of white Protestant ministers, but 52 per cent in cities and 23 per cent in country sections make similar claim.

The analysis of these 21 denominations involves 172,000 churches; but the total ministers involved number less than 105,000. How reconcile the two sets of figures? It is easily done. Only one-half of all these churches had ministers giving undivided attention to them; one in five reported ministers dividing their attention between two societies; one in eight be-

tween three societies; one in six between four or more; while a total of 4,130 reported that their ministers served seven or more societies. The most autonomous bodies, such as the Congregationalists, are supplied with ministers in most liberal proportion, two-thirds of their churches having ministers on full time. The organizations with strongly centralized control, on the other hand, have tended to group small societies into circuits under circuit ministers.

Of recent years there has been an increasing tendency for Protestant bodies of different denominations to combine, no less than 18 such denominations having been involved in such mergers during the last decade under consideration.

A few figures from the Government Report concerning the General Convention of the New Jerusalem may be of interest by way of comparison with the preceding. The membership reported in 1906 was 6,612; in 1916 it was 6,352; and in 1926 it was 5,442 (the decrease in the last decade being due in large part to a different method of counting "members"). Of the 5,442 reported in 1926, 4,962 were in urban territory and 480 in rural, the average number of members to a city church being 71, and to a country church 32. The ratio of men to women was 2 to 3. The average annual expenditure per city church was $3,879, and per rural church $1,143; or approximately $54.63 and $36.00 per member respectively. In 1906 there were 77 Sunday schools, with 510 officers and teachers, and 3,434 pupils; in 1916 there were 67 schools, with 398 officers and teachers and 2,732 pupils; and in 1926 the figures were 58, 391 and 2,621 respectively.

Without now commenting on the figures of the last paragraph in any way, let us turn our attention again to the information that we have culled from Mr. Fry's study of the churches of our nation.

With the exception of the information concerning the wretchedly low educational qualifications of our country's ministry as a whole,—showing that vast numbers of the clerical *profession* have never had any professional training at all, and to that extent tending to discount the standing of that profession

in the world's estimation,—there is little in the figures presented to indicate a serious condition in the church life of our nation, concerning which we hear much from many sides. Unfortunately we have no figures concerning the education of the ministers of our country in 1906 and in 1916 for comparison with those here submitted, and we are therefore unable to draw any conclusions on the basis of comparative figures; but in view of the significance of the decreasing enrollment in the theological schools of our land during the last generation, and of the decease of such a formerly prosperous institution as the Andover Theological Seminary, not to mention other things, it is a safe assumption that comparative figures, if available, would tend to substantiate the ominous forebodings involved in such titles as "Christianity at the Cross Roads," "The Present Crisis in Religion," "The Twilight of Christianity," found on recently published books. From all sides we get evidence of a decline in public interest in organized religious effort; and even in the issue of the *Federal Council Bulletin* for the present January, we find the seriousness of the situation dwelt upon in the following words:

> No subject considered by the Federal Council's Executive Committee called forth a more spontaneous discussion than the report of the Committee on the Conservation and Enrichment of the Lives of Church Members. The extent of the losses in church rolls by "dropping" names of inactive or "lost" members is appalling, as shown in statistics presented by the Committee. An equally disturbing element lies in the large number of those whose names are retained, but who participate little or not at all in the worship or work or support of the Church.
>
> An inquiry to which nearly two hundred representative pastors responded from all parts of the country developed an impressive emphasis, approximating unanimity, to the effect that careless procedure in receiving and caring for new members is largely responsible for present unhappy conditions. Interest in numbers far outruns concern for character. Widespread and profound concern is evident over the light and irresponsible way in which multitudes assume church membership and just as lightly relinquish it.

These statements imply that throughout our land the ministers have been giving undue attention to the question of gaining accessions to their societies, in order to be able to report

growth. "High-pressure" evangelism, a minimizing of doctrinal requirements for membership, sensational sermon topics, entertainment features of many sorts, week-day prayer meetings giving way to social events for the purpose of raising funds, the secularization of religion by the multiplication of parish houses, etc., etc.,—these and other things indicate the unhealthy drift of the times. They indicate that religious observance has been losing its hold increasingly upon the people as a whole. And it is not unreasonable to suggest that this hold has been lessening in proportion to the dissemination and permeation, first among the clergy and thence among the laity, of those ideas and tendencies that result from rationalism, naturalism, humanism, higher criticism, and infidelity generally among the scholars of the church. Our own ministry and our own laity have not been exempt from the infection; and in consequence our organization as a whole is inevitably involved in the eddying drift of the times. So far as the present writer can make out, there is little hope for a bettering of the tendencies except as the educated part of our nation can again be brought to a recognition of the indubitability of the supernatural, the certainty of God, the actuality of immortality, the necessity of revelation, the need of authority for the establishment of truth.

Humanitarian ideals that seem in harmony with New-Church principles and are by some persons viewed as manifestations of the actuality of the "New Church" in the world outside our organization, will militate against rather than help our organization. Only as humanity wakes up to the fact that the most important knowledge of all for each and every individual to have cannot be discovered by the scientific method, or by intellectual activity of any kind, but can come only by revelation, that the greatest revelator of all time was Emanuel Swedenborg, and that the Lord's truth contained in his writings is the authority needed to bring increasing order out of the present moral and spiritual chaos, will conditions become bright for the future of the New Church.

B. A. WHITTEMORE.

"EGYPTIAN DAY."*

The author of "Egyptian Day," Princess Barthe Bibesco, calls it a series of notes, taken on the spur of the moment, on the spot, during a visit to Egypt, as the guest of Lord Lloyd, who was in charge of the British interests there. In consequence she had access to the treasures of Egypt, and was aided by Howard Carter, who directed the search for the relics connected with "poor little King Tut," in the palace at Thebes and elsewhere.

There are but 184 pages in the book, including those given to illustrations; and as the type is very large, and the margins are royal, the actual letterpress is brief. But there is enough to be of some interest to readers of the NEW-CHURCH REVIEW.

First there may come a few lines as to Egyptian Day; that is *value,* in regard to Art. Our Princess says:

> I would send half the contents of Egyptian rooms in all the Museums of the world to the Musée Grévin, or the Chamber of Horrors. Just imagine 3000 years from now, a room, devoted to French art, where the accessories of M. de Borniol, the famous undertaker of Paris, and his clients were on display. There is much bad Egyptian art, but you cannot blame France for the religious images sold in front of Saint Sulpice.

We come now to the Theban temple:

> An American clung to its high wall. He was copying the symbols, and will be there every day for six years. These vestiges of another race are to be carried to a museum in the New World. When people have arrived at a certain level in the scale of human values, they begin to delve into Egypt. This American was overjoyed. On the right doorpost, at the entrance to the Chamber where the bark of Amen was kept, he found a text which narrates the Creation of the Universe.
>
> "The world was drawn forth from chaos by the separation of light and darkness."
>
> The darkness, literally "pitch" (it is pictured as pitch mixed with milk). Amen brings order into the hurly-burly by instituting the succession of days and nights. Until now, Egyptian specialists have completely passed over these lines in silence.
>
> Egyptian idols are only theological virtues personified. The Renais-

---

**Egyptian Day.* By PRINCESS MARTHE BIBESCO. Translated from the French. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co. 1930. 184 pp., 8vo. Cloth, $2.50.

sance did the same thing in putting the three young women, Faith, Hope and Charity, on altars. And in my France we have Jeanne, the Warrior, or St. Thérèse, the Ecstatic. If our successors want to call them goddesses, then we are—pagans.

But the most important statement to us is part of her preface or introduction:

I was led into Egypt by that dread goddess, pneumonia. I came back from the banks of the Nile, cured by the Living-God, and convinced of certain truths contrary to anything I had ever learned about the place. May I note two as examples: one, there is no such thing as lotus in Egypt; two, the Egyptians have always worshipped One God. He is called Father, Omnipotent, Creator of Heaven and Earth, Maker of Things Visible and Invisible, Light of Light, God of Gods, Being Generated without Creation, One with the Father,—not to mention a vast number of other names which had a familiar ring to me.

Among my books on Egypt there is one that confirms our present author's position in the essentials of her book of travel-notes. It was published in London in 1899 (James Spiers), and is by the noted New-Churchman, Dr. J. J. Garth Wilkinson. He had read works by a Dr. Wiedemann, of Bonn, on the Religion of the Ancient Egyptians, and was very favorably impressed. Wilkinson's volume is called, "The Book of Respirations"—a variant from The Book of Breath, the title chosen by the Bonn professor for a collection of ancient Egyptian verses, of some eight pages, describing the descent from Osiris, of a Son, termed Osiris N, who met dangers, gained victories, and eventually ascended triumphant, in ways that resemble the incarnation, life, and conflicts of the Lord Jesus Christ. We know from Swedenborg that Egypt had that prophetic doctrine —at any rate during the Egyptian Day. Just how complete this knowledge became, and how it continued of service, we can only surmise. That in course of time the essentials were lost, is certain.

In a few years, when examination of the relics now at hand, and of others not yet discovered, has been made, it will be easier to appraise the value of Egyptian Day, as its fair heritage is once more accepted and owned.

F. M. Billings.

Easter Cards
Christmas Cards
Celebrating the Birth and the Resurrection of Christ

Choice cards both of foreign and of domestic manufacture. Prices of Easter Cards, 5 and 10 cents; of Christmas Cards from 5 to 50 cents. Mail orders solicited, and satisfaction guaranteed.

The Massachusetts New-Church Union

134 Bowdoin St., Boston 9, Mass.

THE NEW CHURCH MAGAZINE

The Quarterly Organ of the General Conference of the New Church in Great Britain is the oldest New-Church periodical. It is of great interest to New-Church people in all parts of the world. Subscription price $1.25 per year, postpaid.

Order from the

Massachusetts New-Church Union

134 Bowdoin St., Boston 9, Mass.

THEOLOGICAL WORKS OF EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

STANDARD EDITION, $1.00 per volume, postpaid
Also LATIN and LATIN-ENGLISH EDITIONS.
Send for catalogue containing complete lists.

FOR MISSIONARY PURPOSES

we supply the UNIFORM EDITION books (paper) at 5 cents per copy, postpaid. The titles in this edition are: "Heaven and Hell," "Divine Love and Wisdom," "Divine Providence," and "The Four Doctrines."

SWEDENBORG FOUNDATION
Incorporated

18 East 41st Street **New York, N. Y.**

THE ROTCH TRUST FUND

Mrs. Lydia S. Rotch died in Boston, July 20, 1863, at the age of 80 years. She left $15,000 to be administered by three trustees for the benefit of the Convention. The activity of this Fund, administered by its successive three trustees, has been primarily that of the publication of Swedenborg's Theological Writings, commentaries compiled therefrom, and other works, as follows:

A complete edition of the Theological Works published by Swedenborg.

"The Worship and Love of God."

Commentaries on Matthew, John, Ezekiel and the Psalms.

Selections from Swedenborg, in raised type for the blind.

"Swedenborg, Harbinger of the New Age of the Christian Church," by Benjamin Worcester.

All of these publications are available through the several New-Church book-rooms, to wit:

UNITED STATES.

Akron, Ohio. New-Church Book Room 369 So. Maple St., Room 6.
Baltimore, Md. Swedenborg Book Center, 3812 Barrington Road.
Boston, Mass. Massachusetts New-Church Union, 134 Bowdoin St.
Chicago, Ill. Western New-Church Union, Rooms 1745-6, 17 N. State St.
Cincinnati, Ohio. New-Church Library, Oak and Winslow Streets.
Detroit, Mich. Church Book Shop, 92 E. Forest Ave.
Los Angeles, Calif. New-Church Book Room, 509 So. Westmoreland Ave.
Minneapolis, Minn. New-Church Book Shop, 903 Fifth Ave., So.
New York, N. Y. Swedenborg Foundation, Inc., 18 E. 41 St., Manhattan.
New-Church Press, 108 Clark St., Brooklyn Heights, N. Y. City.
Philadelphia, Pa. New-Church Book Association, 2129 Chestnut St.
San Francisco, Calif. New-Church Library, 1640 O'Farrell St.
St. Louis, Mo. New-Church Book Room, 1215 Sunset Ave.
Washington, D. C. New-Church Library, 16th and Corcoran Street.
Wilmington, Del. New-Church Book Room, Penn Ave. and Broome St.

CANADA.

Toronto, Ont. Wm. H. Law, 486 Euclid Ave.

ENGLAND.

London. The Swedenborg Society, and The New-Church Press, Ltd., 20 Hart St., Bloomsbury, W. C. 1.
Manchester. New-Church Book Depot, 31 John Dalton St.
Glasgow, Scotland. Scottish New-Church Library, 229 Woodland Road.

AUSTRALIA.

Brisbane, Queensland. 345 Ann St., near Wharf St.

INDIA.

Bombay. Swedenborg Society of India, 259 Bellasis Road, Byculla, Bombay.

SWITZERLAND.

Lausanne. Agence des Publications de la Nouvelle Eglise, 25 Rue de Bourg.

The Fund assists, from time to time, in other New-Church uses to the extent that it has available funds; for example, the Neighborhood House at Lynn, Mass., to the support of which it regularly contributes. It has also coöperated in the publication of some of Swedenborg's scientific works, and of the photofacsimile reproductions of Swedenborg's theological manuscripts.

The original sum is intact, and the income only is used. This is, of course, entirely inadequate to help all the uses which come before the Rotch Trustees for contributions, including many for which other New-Church funds are not available because of their limitations. It is estimated that since the death of Mrs. Rotch, the trustees have spent over $65,000.00 in various church uses.

Will friends of the New Church continually bear in mind the importance of increasing the Rotch Trust Fund, whether by "giving while living" or by will?

The present Trustees are:

GEORGE C. WARREN, *President*,
CHARLES N. MASON,
JOHN W. HATHAWAY, *Secretary and Treasurer*,
18 Tremont St., Boston, Mass.